The Pope's Catechism

BY
J. SHEATSLEY

Bc

BX 1765 .S443 1917
Sheatsley, J.
The Pope's catechism : or, the teachings of Roman Catholicism made plain for Protestants /

THE POPE'S CATECHISM

OR

The Teachings of Roman Catholicism Made Plain

FOR

PROTESTANTS

By REV. J. SHEATSLEY

COLUMBUS, OHIO:
LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN
1917

BX
1765
.S443
1917

CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREWORD — Note	5
THE PURPOSE OF THE BOOKLET	9
THE CHURCH	12
1. What the Church is	13
2. The Government of the Church	18
3. The Marks of the Church	23
THE POPE	35
1. The Pope as the Visible Head of the Church	35
2. The Pope's Infallibility	48
THE PRIESTHOOD	54
THE WORK OF CHRIST	61
THE RULE OF FAITH	65
1. The Holy Scriptures	65
2. Tradition	79
THE MEANS OF GRACE	85
1. The Holy Scriptures	85
2. The Sacraments	90
1). Confirmation	93
2). Penance	97
a. The Power of the Priest	98
b. Telling One's Sins	98
c. Satisfaction	100
d. Indulgences	105
3). Extreme Unction	113
4). Holy Orders	117
5). Matrimony	120
6). The Holy Eucharist	123
a. Transubstantiation	124
b. The Power of the Priest to Change the Elements	126
c. The Adoration of the Host	128
d. Communion in One Kind	131
e. The Sacrifice of the Mass	133
SACRAMENTALS	143

PAGE

FAITH 147
JUSTIFICATION 154
GOOD WORKS 159
PRAYER 170
1. The Merit of Prayer 170
2. Prayer for the Dead 171
3. Prayer to Saints 172
4. Prayer to Angels 174
5. Vain Repetitions 175
PURGATORY 177
THE SPIRIT OF ROME 182
A LIST OF ROMISH ERRORS AND HERESIES 186

NOTE: The reader will notice that in the first part of the book Scripture passages are quoted from the A. V., while in the second part they are taken from the R. V. This is due to the fact that the second part was written several years after the first and the quotations were there made without having first looked from what version the quotations in the first part were taken.

FOREWORD.

IT does not need that the writer of this foreword should say one word of introduction for the author of this volume, so well and favorably known as pastor of the University Church in Columbus and Editor of the *Lutheran Standard* and author of several well known and valuable contributions to our sermonic literature, but, after a careful examination of the pages, if a few words of endorsement will serve to bring the facts herein set forth to the notice of any one anxious to be absolutely clear on some of the questions touching the great differences between the principles of the Lutheran Reformation and those of the Church of Rome, I will gladly say them.

It has been my experience to find a great lack of knowledge amongst all sorts of people, upon many questions touching the doctrines and ceremonies of the Romish Church, this lack of knowledge is perhaps the reason for the widespread demand for that class of lecture that sets forth Rome's teachings. It is and always has been the policy of the Church of Rome to keep the real inwardness of the church from the general public. Publicity has never been the policy of the Roman Hierarchy, hence what the true inwardness of the church is has always to the faithful been an unknown quantity and to the non-Catholic a speculation. This in part accounts for the commonly acknowledged fact that the Roman Catholic layman is as friendly to his Protestant neighbor as

he is, and for another fact that the ordinary Protestant considers his Roman Catholic neighbor a good sort of man and cannot understand what all this opposition to Rome's teaching is about. The writer or speaker will always be heard who comes with a real message for men, with something that gives true light upon some vexed question and that is what one finds in the pages of this volume.

Especially is this true in this year of Grace 1917, when the whole Christian world is stirred by the celebration of the four-hundredth anniversary of the Reformation Dawn. At this time the real teachings of Rome as opposed by the Reformers should be known and not the misrepresentations of these teachings as published by such writers as Cardinal Gibbons, nor the misunderstood teachings as held by many a preacher in the Protestant world.

The consumate skill used in the handling of words by Romish writers always provokes a smile from the man who knows the real intent of the sophistry. Take for instance the statement made by Cardinal Gibbons in one of his works written for Protestant readers. He says: "After his ordination every priest is obliged to devote upwards of an hour each day to the perusal of God's Word." At once the Protestant reader thinks, "That is good," and at once he pictures in his mind the priest sitting in his study poring over the Word of God and by the aid of the Holy Spirit trying to find the Way of Life there. He takes the words of the writer to mean just what Bible study means to a Protestant generally, but what is the real case. Towards the end of this same volume, when the writer thinks that the reader has forgotten what was said at the beginning, he says, "The

church requires of her clergy that they devote at least an hour each day to the recitation of the Divine Office, which consists chiefly of the Psalms and other portions of Holy Scripture, the Homilies of the early Fathers and prayers of marvelous force and unction." This last statement is the true statement.

The daily reading of the Bible is the saying of the Divine Office and never varies from year to year. That is they read today what was read yesterday. It is a repetition from day to day of the same passages of Scripture, sayings of the Fathers and prayers. The sayings of the Fathers being on a par with the statements of the Holy and inspired Word.

It would be possible to give many an illustration of the sophistry of the Hierarchy, to show with what double purpose and meaning the words, used in stating the Romish position on a teaching of the church, are selected. In answer to the question, "Are Protestants Saved?" the answer is, "Yes, if he believes as he does, through no fault of his." This answer, which seems quite harmless in itself, can be so construed that it places every Protestant beyond the pale of salvation, or, as Rev. Father Coakley says, "A soul lost to the Catholic church is a soul lost to Christianity."

To make clear the teachings of Rome is the purpose of this work. How far has the author succeeded? In no statement of his has he overstated the position of the Church of Rome on any given proposition, indeed, to my mind he has not gone quite far enough. He might have made some statements stronger, especially where he uses words of condemnation; however, it is ever well to err on the side of mercy. Furthermore, the inferences drawn from the position of the catechism have in every

instance been true, but here again the author might have drawn a stronger conclusion; but it is not in the character of this sincere and cultured Christian pastor to ever appear severe in his condemnation of sinners, therefore his words of moderation.

Do you, therefore, desire absolutely safe and reliable information upon this most important subject? Do you desire to know without peradventure just what the Church of Rome teaches regarding the Way of Life? Do you wish to be safe, in any statement you may wish to make, regarding the same teachings? Do you wish to have something that you can place in the hands of an inquiring soul, that will be absolutely reliable? Do you wish something that you can give to some one whose feet are standing in slippery places, something that will stay him, if he is a sincere soul? Then you will find it here, and you need not hesitate to spread the information here given, it is absolutely reliable and will through the Grace of God help any inquiring soul to find the way out of the darkness of superstition to the true light of the Word of God.

S. H. Dobbyn.

New Lexington, Ohio, Epiphany, 1917.

Note: Dr. Dobbyn himself was a priest in the Roman Catholic Church. He, however, discovered Rome's false teaching and therefore withdrew and accepted the Lutheran faith as the true statement of the teachings of Holy Scriptures. We therefore deem Dr. Dobbyn's endorsement of what has been set forth in this booklet as especially significant and convincing.

The reader will find throughout the volume a few footnotes, mostly quite brief. They are also from the pen of Dr. Dobbyn; and referring as they do to important points of doctrine they should be given due consideration.

THE PURPOSE OF THIS BOOKLET.

During our ministry of more than twenty-five years we have lost more members to the Roman Catholic church than to any two other denominations together. They were not many, we can count them on the fingers of one hand; but there were enough to annoy us and to fill us with sadness.

Every time the thing occurred we looked around for some suitable literature to place in the hands of the person under assault, but we always failed to find just the thing for the occasion. We wanted something plain, not too long, and something above all that carries authority. One cannot fight Roman Catholicism, nor for that matter any other error, with mere opinions, nor loose statements, nor broad assertions, and especially not with mere abuse. We need the exact facts, the naked plain truths, taken from the pope's own storehouse. These facts and truths need to be given in plain language, applied directly to the point in question; and the whole discussion must bear the stamp of unquestioned fairness.

Doubtless literature of this kind dealing with the Romish church is to be had, but we failed to find it; nor have we found it up to date. This is our reason for writing this booklet.

The Authority of this Booklet.

To make sure that the truth of what we are about to say may not be questioned, we shall not formulate the

false teachings of the Romish church ourselves, but shall quote them from the pope's own catechism. Wherever these doctrines need further explanation, we shall explain them so far as possible with quotations from the same source. Where we shall be obliged to make comments of our own — and that necessity will be recurring constantly — we shall try to be absolutely fair. We shall not foist a sense upon the words of the catechism which Rome herself did not intend.

Over against the words of the catechism we shall place God's Word. That Word we shall explain, where explanation is needed, as the Bible explains itself, and as the Holy Spirit has given us light to understand it.

The following is the full title of the catechism from which we shall quote:

Deharbe's

LARGE CATECHISM,

translated by

A Father of the Society of Jesus, of the Province of Missouri, from the German Edition prepared for the United States, with the approval and cooperation of the author and approved by His Grace, the Most Rev. Archbishop of St. Louis.

New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago;
Benziger Brothers.
Printers to the Holy Apostolic See.
Publishers of Benziger's Magazine.

The catechism bears the endorsement of thirteen prelates, of which the following is one:

"As the Catholic Catechism of the pious Father Joseph Deharbe, S. J., has received not only numerous approbations from the prelates of Europe, but also their warmest recom-

mendation, and as the edition published by Benziger Brothers was revised by several prelates with the cooperation of the author, we recommend it to the pastors of our diocese.

C. H. Borgess,
Bishop of Detroit."

We want to add here yet that we have taken the catechism as our source instead of the larger and more learned confessions of the Romish church, such as the Decrees of the Council of Trent, simply because the catechism is more popular, is more easily understood and especially because it is the book that is used, just as in our own church, in the instruction of children and doubtless too in the instruction of adults who are preparing for their first communion. This source then should not only give us the essential teachings and practices of the Romish church, but it should give them in a form too that the average man can readily grasp.

Furthermore, we shall not give the entire catechism of Rome, not all her teachings, but only those that conflict with the word of God; for our object is not to prepare persons to enter the Romish church, but to warn them against her. Rome has some truth, but she has so much dangerous error that we need to warn against her with all our might.

THE CHURCH.

The catechism from which we quote consists of three chief parts. After a very short introduction, speaking of the "End for which we are Created", it takes up the subject of faith and treats fully of the Apostles' Creed. The second chief part treats of the commandments. The third chief part deals with the sacraments, of which the church of Rome, as is well known, has seven.

As we are not aiming to set forth all the teachings of Rome, but only her errors, we shall not follow the above threefold division of Christian doctrine, but we shall take up her false teachings in the order which to us seems best calculated to show their importance and their great danger.

We begin with Rome's teaching concerning the Church. We can best understand Rome's whole system from this view-point, for according to her teaching a man's salvation in the end depends upon what the Church says and does. In a tree the branches, twigs and leaves, together with their growth and existence, all depend upon the trunk. So according to Rome, what a man is to believe and do for his salvation, the use and the benefits of the sacraments, and salvation itself finally — all depend upon the Church. This might be understood correctly, but we shall see just what Rome means.

We shall consider the following questions, together with their answers and proof passages. We shall always

give the number of the questions for convenience of reference, in case any one should want to get the catechism and refer to it:

1. What the Church is.

13. What, then, is the Church?

The Church is the congregation of all the faithful on earth, professing the true Faith, governed by their lawful Bishops and united under one visible Head.

14. Who is the visible Head of the Church?

The visible Head of the Church is the lawful successor of St. Peter in the Episcopal see of Rome, Our Holy Father, the Pope.

15. Who are the successors of the other Apostles?

The Bishops of the Catholic Church, who in communion with the Pope, as their Head, govern their respective dioceses, are the successors of the other Apostles.

16. Who are the assistants of the Bishops?

The priests subject to them, are the assistants of the Bishops.

These questions and their answers give us a fine starting point. They show how Rome looks upon the Church as a visible organization. The pope stands at the head; next under him are the bishops; under the bishops are the priests; under the priests are the various individual congregations and the individual members of these congregations. This is the outward organization of the Romish church all over the world as any one can easily see.

The following series of questions makes the matter still plainer and more convincing:

4. What office did Christ confer on Peter alone?

Christ conferred on Peter alone the office of Supreme Head of His Church.

5. Is not Christ Himself the Head of the Church?

Christ is indeed the Head of the Church, but He is the invisible Head; Peter, however, is the visible Head.

6. Why did Christ appoint a visible Head over His Church?

Because the Church being a visible community or body, it must have a visible Head.

7. Was the office entrusted to Peter and the Apostles to cease with them?

No; the office entrusted to Peter and the Apostles was to endure to the end of the world, because the Church is always to continue as Christ established it.

The answer to question 8 shows how the apostles, after they had received the Holy Ghost on Pentecost, went forth into all the world and preached the Gospel and baptized all who repented and gathered all the believers into congregations. This is all good and correct. But directly follow other questions, again emphasizing the external organization of the Church:

9. What arose from these congregations of believers?

There arose communities of Christians, whose rulers were St. Peter and the other Apostles as representatives of Christ.

10. What else did the Apostles do, when the communities of Christians increased?

They ordained Bishops, and appointed them everywhere as rulers of the new Christian communities, and authorized them to ordain and appoint others.

The King's Library

11. Were all these several Christian communities united with one another?

Yes; they were all closely united with one another; they professed the same faith, partook of the same sacraments, and altogether formed one great Christian family under one common Head, St. Peter.

12. What did they call this great family of Christians under one common Head?

They called this great family of Christians under one common Head the Catholic, that is, the Universal Church, or, in one word, the Church.*

From what we have quoted so far it is quite plain that Rome attaches vast importance to the external organization of the Church.

What now does the word of God say about this matter? The Church has an outward side; there can be no question on that point. Man himself has an outward side; he has a body, he occupies space, he must observe time and place in his life and activities. If then a man is in the Church at all, he is there with his body as well as with his soul. The Church therefore is not a communion or assembly of souls or spirits only, but an assembly of human beings who have souls and bodies. That is the way we are in the Church, here upon earth at least. At death the body is left behind and only our soul ascends to dwell in the Church Triumphant. But at the resurrection the bodies are to be raised again and

* Some of the catechisms come out boldly and declare that Christ also designated Peter and the other apostles and their successors as the "Teaching Church". Everywhere this body is confounded with the "Church" as defined above. This statement is based upon the words to Peter, "Feed my sheep" (Priests etc.), "Feed my lambs" (Communicants).

reunited with their souls and then we shall forever be with the Lord in soul and glorified body.

When Christ therefore came upon earth to establish His Church, He began by gathering about himself a company of followers whom He called disciples. At His ascension into heaven He sent these men forth into all the world and told them to preach the Gospel and make more disciples. He certainly meant too that those who believed should in some way be gathered together into groups or assemblies. He meant too that these groups should be cared for, just as He himself had cared for the twelve. To Peter, Christ said after His resurrection, "Feed my sheep"; "Feed my lambs". John 21, 15-17. Paul said to the elders at Ephesus, "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood". Acts 20, 28.

It is plain too that these persons who were to care for these groups of believers, which we now generally call congregations, had to be appointed by some one. The above passage from Acts shows that they were really placed in charge by the Holy Ghost himself.

The Holy Ghost however did this through the Church, that is, through the congregations. How this was done may be seen from the appointment of Matthias as successor to Judas (Acts 1, 15-26); and from the election of the seven whose chief duty it was to look after the poor and who afterwards came to be called deacons. Acts 6, 1-6. In the case of Matthias, we find that he was chosen by the assembly, but God in answer to their prayer directed the choice so that the right person was selected. The seven deacons were likewise

chosen by the assembly or congregation and then ordained by the apostles. This last act consisted in prayer and the laying on of hands by which the persons were solemnly set apart for the work to which they had been elected.

These two examples doubtless give us the manner in which elders, or bishops as they were sometimes called, were chosen and set apart for their work. When we read in Acts 14, 23 that the apostles "ordained them elders in every church" and when Paul in Titus 1, 5, instructs Titus to "ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee", we are doubtless to understand it in this way, that the apostle took charge of the meeting, but that the congregation chose their men, the apostle telling them too what kind of men were desirable, and that then these men were solemnly ordained by the visiting apostle or apostles.

It is quite plain then from the very beginning that the Church has an outward side. The believers in a certain community are drawn together and form a congregation. They must have a place to meet, they must have a time for meeting. Some one must be placed over the congregation and have matters generally in charge. This person may be called elder, or bishop, or priest, or pastor; it really matters little what the name is. He must feed the congregations, sheep and lambs, as Jesus said to Peter. That means that he must preach to them and teach them the word of God and administer to them the sacraments. He must look after the spiritual welfare of the people generally. He must also rule over them in a certain sense, that is, see that the people obey the word of God and that everything is done decently and in order. Under this overseer may be other persons whose

duty it is to assist him in the work and especially to look after the more external matters of the congregation, such as taking care of the church property, seeing after the poor, and the like.

When a number of congregations now unite to form a synod, as we usually call such a body, then still other work and other interests appear. These congregations may decide to start a school for the education of ministers and school teachers; they may build a home for orphans or for aged people; they may begin missionary work on a larger scale than one congregation alone could do; and there are still many other sorts of work in which they can engage. All these things require organization, officers, buildings, and the like. Such then are the things that make up the external side of the Church; and they are all necessary.

What then is our objection to the church of Rome, for laying great emphasis upon these external matters? Our objection is this, that she makes too much of these things; she makes our salvation depend upon certain things which are not essential at all; that is, they do not need to be just as Rome says they must be; and our salvation is not dependent upon their being as Rome says they must be.

2. The Government of the Church.

Rome teaches that there must be one certain form of government for the Church. In answer to question thirteen above, what the Church is, she says, "The Church is the congregation of all the faithful on earth, professing the true faith." So far it is all good; we agree fully. In our catechism we say of the Church or

the Communion of Saints, that it is "all those who truly believe in Christ." When she says further, "governed by their lawful Bishops", we can also agree, at least in part, that is, each congregation needs some one as pastor or elder, or bishop, if you please, whose chief duty, however, is not to govern, as Rome has it, but to feed or shepherd, as Christ has it: "Feed my sheep", "Feed my lambs".

But when Rome now adds, "united under one visible Head", that is, under the pope, then we balk completely. We find no such teaching, neither by Christ nor by the apostles, that all believers in the world must be under the thumb of a man. Such a claim is not only folly, but it is blasphemy, it is claiming for a man a prerogative which belongs to Christ alone.

However, we expect to devote the next chapter to "His Holiness" the pope and we shall therefore not discuss this particular point any further here.

In answer now to the claim that the Church must have a certain particular form of government we offer the following:

First, Christ himself nowhere says anything about a particular form of government for His Church. The only place where His words imply that there is an outward organization at all is Matthew 18, 17, where in giving direction concerning the treatment of a man who has been found guilty of some sin and who upon admonition does not repent, He says: "And if he neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican". By "church" we are here to understand a local congregation. That is plain. Such a congregation has of course some form of government;

some one is at the head of the congregation and under him may be other offices. Such was the organization of the Jewish synagogue and Jesus knew that the Christian congregation which would succeed the synagogue would likewise have some such government. To this church then, that is, congregation, — but note well, not to the pastor of the congregation —the trespassing member should be referred for final action.

Jesus's words to Peter, that He will give unto him the keys of the kingdom of heaven, will be considered fully in the next chapter; suffice it to say here only that Jesus is there speaking of the exercise of spiritual power through the word and the sacraments and not at all that Peter should set up some particular form of church government.

Secondly, the apostles likewise did nothing more than ordain elders or bishops in every church, that is, congregation, as we have already seen above. That the apostles, however, plainly understood that they had no authority of themselves to impose upon the congregations a particular form of government is seen from this that they did not even appoint the bishops. Each congregation appointed its own bishop. Thus Matthias was appointed to succeed Judas. If Peter was the head of the Church, why did not he then and there appoint Judas' successor? So too the seven deacons were appointed. Acts 6. The order seemed to be this: the congregation appointed the elder and then the visiting apostle or elder by the laying on of hands and by prayer set him apart for his holy work.

Thirdly, this whole matter of outward government for the Church is very secondary. If it had been necessary that the Church have some particular form of

government, Christ or the apostles would certainly have made it plain just what that form of government must be. All along they tell us that the Church is primarily a spiritual body, a communion of believers or saints.

Jesus said, John 8, 31-32, "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." He does not say, Ye must belong to an outward organization which is governed by one man called the pope; but, Ye must believe in Me, hold fast to My word and live in it; then shall ye be My true disciples.

Again, Jesus speaks of himself as the vine and believers as the branches: "I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing". John 15, 1-5. Jesus here speaks of himself and the whole body of believers. In other words, He is speaking here of the Church under the figure of a vine. But He does not say that we must be joined in an external way to a man called the pope, but that we must be joined to Christ himself and that in a spiritual way, that is, through faith.

Paul says, Eph. 2, 19-22: "Now ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit". Paul here compares the Church to a building; the teachings of the apostles are the foundation, but in this foundation Christ

himself, that is, His teaching, His work and His person, is the chief corner-stone, the real foundation. Into Him the saints are built through faith and thus they become a spiritual temple. Notice well; it is a spiritual body, not an external organization; and the believers are built into Christ, not into the pope.

The apostle Peter, 1 Pet. 2, 4-5, makes use of a similar figure: "To whom coming, as unto a living stone, disallowed inded of men, but chosen of God and precious, ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ". According to the Romish idea Peter at this time was pope and must have known the importance of an external organization for the Church, why did he not say something about it here or elsewhere in his letters? If the external form of the Church was so essential, why did he speak only of its spiritual character?

Peter is such a good witness that we quote him again: "But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvelous light". 1 Pet. 2, 9. Here again he represents the Church under the figure of a nation or people as a purely spiritual body.

We might quote many more passages showing that the Church is a spiritual body, a communion of saints; but we believe that the above suffice to show that, though the Church as a matter of course has an external side in this world, yet nothing is said in the Scriptures that it must assume this or that particular form of government and be united under a pope.

3. The Marks of the Church.

19. By what marks may the true Church of Christ be known?

The true Church of Christ may be known by these four marks: 1, she is One; 2, she is Holy; 3, she is Catholic; 4, she is Apostolic.

20. Which Church has all these four marks?

The Roman Catholic Church; that is, the Church which acknowledges the Pope of Rome as her Head.

21. How is the Roman Catholic Church One?

The Roman Catholic Church is evidently One because she has at all times and in all places—

1. The same faith;
2. The same sacrifice and the same sacraments;
3. The same common Head.

In reply to the above we say: It is true that the Church of Christ has at all times and places the one same faith, but we shall see as we proceed that it is by no means the faith that Rome teaches.

When Rome speaks of the same sacrifice as a mark of oneness she has in mind, of course, the sacrifice of the mass which is no mark at all of the true Church, but an abomination invented by Rome herself,* as we shall see when we come to treat of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

Another mark of the oneness of the Church is that she must have the same Sacraments. When we come to speak of the Sacraments we shall find that Rome has seven Sacraments, while the Bible knows of only two.

The last mark of the oneness of the Church is that she has a common Head. If Christ who is the head of

* That is good.

the Church were meant, the statement would be correct, but Rome means by this "common Head" the pope. But to have the pope the head of the church is no mark at all of the true Church, but on the contrary a mark of a false church, as we have already seen and shall see still more clearly.

22. How is the Roman Catholic Church Holy?

The Roman Catholic Church is Holy —

1. Because she has a holy Founder and a holy doctrine;

2. Because she faithfully preserves and dispenses all the means of holiness;

3. Because she always has Saints whose holliness God confirms by miracles.

In speaking of the first mark of holiness as given under the above question we say that the founder of the Christian Church was of course Christ and that her doctrines are of necessity holy, but by church Rome does not mean the communion of saints as we understand it, but only the Roman Catholic church. Of her we must say that neither is Christ the founder, for He never established an external organization under one head; nor, as we shall see in proceeding, are all her doctrines holy, but many of them the very opposite.

As to faithfully preserving and dispensing the means of holiness, that we shall also find to be a false claim. We have already discovered one false claim, namely, that Christ established the Church with a certain external form of government.

Concerning "Saints" as a mark of holiness we certainly believe that the Church has saints, yes, is made up of saints and of saints only, "the communion of saints". Paul in writing to the churches frequently calls

them saints as in his letter to the church at Rome: "To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints". But of saints whose holiness is certified by miracles Paul knows nothing. He speaks of Phebe, "a servant of the church which is at Cenchrea" as a saint and of others, Rom. 1, 1-15; but they were saints, not because of any miracles done by them, neither because of any good works, but because they were justified through faith and had forgiveness of sins and because the Holy Ghost was in them leading them on to holiness of life. Nor do any of the other apostles or Christ himself know anything of saints who became such by miracles which God should have done through them. However, we expect to speak of Romish saints in another place and will therefore pass the matter by here.

23. How is the Roman Catholic Church Catholic or Universal?

The Roman Catholic Church is Catholic or Universal —

1. Because she has continually existed from the time of Christ;

2. Because she is spread over the entire world;

3. Because she always teaches the whole doctrine of Christ.

Concerning the first of the above points we say that much which the Romish Catholic church makes essential in her teaching and life did not exist from the beginning. We have already seen that Christ did not establish the Church with any outward form of government, that He did not set a visible head over the Church. Everybody knows that Christ does not forbid ministers to marry; Peter himself was married. Everybody knows likewise that Christ did not forbid the laity the cup.

We shall find many other things which Rome claims for herself that were not in the Church at the beginning. Her claim then that the Roman Catholic church existed from the time of Christ is false.

Rome of course teaches that divine revelation did not cease with the apostles, but that the Holy Spirit continued to make new revelations to the Church and that He may still do so. In that way she explains the new doctrines that have appeared since the days of the apostles; for example, that the priests must not marry, that the laity should not receive the wine in the sacrament, that the pope is infallible, and still others. But that is plainly a false claim.

We well know that the Holy Spirit was given to the Church and that He will abide with the Church until the end; also, that He at all times leads the Church into all truth. Christ said, "When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will show you things to come". John 16, 13. There is no promise here, however, that the Holy Ghost would grant new revelations — something different from what Christ himself had already said — even unto the apostles. On the contrary Christ says expressly that "he shall not speak of himself" — nothing new or different from what Christ had taught; but "he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you" (v. 14). And again Jesus says, "He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you".

The above passages show very plainly that the apostles did not expect any new revelation from the Spirit, anything different and additional to what Jesus had al-

ready given them. His work was, on the one hand, to recall to the apostles' minds all that Jesus had said and that He wanted recorded for the use of the Church in all times; on the other hand, He was to enable the apostles to understand fully these words of Jesus that they might explain them more fully for the Church at all times. This further explanation we have in the Acts and in the Epistles. But here there is nothing new, nothing additional to what Jesus himself had already taught.

But lest there still might be some uncertainty on this point and to stop forever the mouths of such as claim new revelations, the Spirit says expressly at the end of the book that the revelation is closed: "For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book". Rev. 22, 18-19. And these words, although they refer expressly to the last book of the New Testament, yet apply also to all the rest. Nothing is to be added to and nothing to be taken from what Jesus and the apostles have given us. There is a similar command in the Old Testament near the end of the five books of Moses: "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you". Deut. 4, 2.

There is therefore no authority in Scripture for the Romish church to add any new and additional doctrine to what Christ and the apostles gave the Church. She

may add outward things in church government and in forms of service, provided they do not come in conflict with the teachings of Christ and the apostles, but anything new in the nature of doctrine is false and did not exist from the beginning.

The second proof that the Romish church is Catholic or Universal is that she is "spread over the entire world." This claim is true only in a very general way. There are large sections of heathen countries in which there are no Roman Catholic congregations, nor congregations of other churches either; there are also smaller civilized countries where there are no Catholic churches as, for example, in Iceland which is entirely Lutheran. The claim that she is spread over the whole world can be made in this general way also of the Lutheran Church.

The third proof given is that she "always teaches the whole doctrine of Christ". We shall be better able to understand this point when we have once examined all the teachings of Rome; we shall see then that she does not teach all the doctrine of Christ, just as we have already seen that she teaches more than Christ did by declaring that there must be a particular form of church government with a visible head, the pope.

24. How is the Roman Catholic Church Apostolic?

The Roman Catholic Church is Apostolic —

1. Because her origin and her doctrine are derived from the Apostles;

2. Because her Rulers, the Pope and the Bishops, are the lawful successors of the Apostles.

In regard to the first point we say that in so far as the doctrines of the Romish church are in harmony with

God's word both her origin and her doctrines are from the apostles, but in so far as she teaches and practices error she is certainly not from the apostles. We have already seen some of her errors; we shall see many more.

On the second point we say that any ruler, pope or bishop, who teaches contrary to God's word is no successor of the apostles. Jesus says, "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves". And Paul says with all the energy of his ardent spirit, "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed". Gal. 1, 8.

In the above claim we furthermore meet again with a twofold error of Rome, namely, first, that she calls those who stand over the churches or congregations *rulers*, not pastors or shepherds as Jesus did when He commanded Peter to feed His sheep and His lambs. Rome cannot get away from the idea of rule, of external authority; any one who has any knowledge at all of how a priest rules his congregation knows that he is the sole authority and that the people must do as he says. The other error which we have noted repeatedly is that Rome insists that the government by pope, bishops and priests was established by the apostles and that there can be no other form of church government. But we have already seen (see under questions 9-12) that these things are all wrong, that the outward government is a secondary matter and that the apostles do not prescribe a particular form of government which must be used in every case. The important thing is that the Church is a

communion of believers who are ruled solely by the word of God.

From the above four marks, which Rome says designate her as the true church, we pass on to what she has to say about other churches.

25. Have not the sects that are separated from the Church these four marks?

The sects separated from the Church have not these four marks of the true Church, because —

1. They have not Christ for their founder; they arose centuries after Christ had established His Church;

2. They have not the same faith and doctrine; on the contrary they differ one from another and are continually changing their doctrines;

3. They have no common Head, nor rulers who are the legitimate successors of the Apostles;

4. They have not one saint whose holiness God confirms by miracles;

5. They are not spread over the world.

26. If none but the Roman Catholic Church has the marks of the Church of Christ, what is the conclusion?

That the Roman Catholic Church alone is the Church established by Christ, and hence that all are bound to be members of that Church.

Referring to point one under question 25, we again see that Rome thinks only of the outward form of the Church. In that sense Christ of course founded none of these churches, just as He did not found the Romish Church (questions 9-12). But the essential thing is not the form of government, but whether they hold to the word of Christ: "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed." John 8, 31. Any church that accepts the word of Christ and lives in that word is in

so far of the Church of Christ and was established by Christ, no matter what the outward form of government may be.

Relative to the second point, it is clear that the other churches do not teach the same doctrines throughout; it is likewise clear that in so far as any of them depart from God's word they are in so far false churches and their teachers false prophets. And as to changing their doctrines, if they change from error to truth, it is all good; but if they change from truth to error as is often done, it is all wrong. Here the primary thing is not to have the same doctrine throughout; for if that same doctrine is wrong, they are all wrong, even as Rome is all wrong in many things. But the first and important thing is to have the truth. They that have the truth are of Christ, no matter in what church they may be; and they that have not the truth do not have Christ, no matter if they are in the church of Rome.

On the third point we have said so much already that nothing more needs to be added here, except to repeat that Christ did not establish a particular form of government for His Church with a visible head called the pope.

On point four we say that all who truly believe in Christ are saints (see under question 22). And here again it matters not in which church body the persons are; for it is not their connection with a church that makes them saints, but their connection with Christ. Just who these are God alone knows for a certainty. As to saints confirmed to be such by miracles, the Bible knows nothing at all. The Romish church claims many such, but it is commonly known that the miracles attributed to them are generally frauds perpetrated by a de-

signing priesthood upon a credulous people. Granted that some of the miracles claimed have actually been done, Rome needs to consider seriously who may have been the real doer. Not everything that has the appearance of the miraculous is from the Lord. Paul speaks expressly of that wicked one "whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders". 2 Thess. 2, 8-9. This passage of Paul is especially significant here because the description of "that Wicked One" which he gives in this chapter fits the pope exceedingly well.*

On the fifth point we say that the time was when the Romish Church was not spread over the whole earth, consequently according to her own claim she could not have been the true church then. Besides, she is not spread over the whole earth yet in the full sense of that term (see under question 23). And furthermore the Lutheran Church alone is extended about as much as is the Romish, so that she has about as strong a claim in this respect to being the true Church as Rome. But here again, whether a church is a true or false church does not depend upon its outward dimensions, but upon its inner relation to Christ.

The conclusion which Rome draws with reference to other churches is of course natural. All other churches are false churches, because they are not a part of her and do not stand under the one visible head, the pope at Rome. Likewise all the people who belong to these other churches are not members of the true Church

* That is to the point.

and hence cannot be saved; for if they are not in the Church, they must be outside, and that can only mean that they still belong to the world and the devil. On this point we may yet quote question:

33. Why is the Catholic Church called the "only saving" Church?

Because she alone was established by Christ and commissioned to save men's souls.

Anyone then who does not come under the protecting wings of the Romish church is doomed to everlasting destruction; that seems to be the only inference. If this were said of "the Christian Church, the communion of saints", it would, of course, be true; but it is said of the Roman Catholic church and therefore it does not worry us in the least. What we cannot understand is how men can become so blind to the plain truth of God's word as to believe such nonsense.

It should be interesting here to quote an item from "Perry's Instructions" which is quite an extended explanation of the Romish catechism. He is speaking of the Catholic character of the Romish church, that she is spread over the whole earth. Then he turns to the other churches: *"But sects seldom extend over one nation; they bear the name of the place to which they are confined, or of their founder, who, long after the Apostles, gave them birth. Their missionary accounts of success are completely false."*

We have already spoken of the Lutheran Church as being extended almost over the whole earth, though of course not so large in numbers as the Roman Catholic. A number of nations furthermore are entirely Luth-

eran, such as the greater part of the German Empire, Norway and Sweden, Denmark, Finland, other portions of Russia, a part of Austria, Iceland, with great numbers in the United States. But what we should notice in the above statement in particular is what is said about the missionary accounts of Protestants. The words seem to be a wilful and malicious misstatement of the facts in the case. It would be interesting to place side by side the missionary work of the Protestants and the Catholics and see who is doing the most.

THE POPE.

1. The Pope as the Visible Head of the Church.

The consideration of the pope should by right come in the chapter on the Church because he is the head of the Roman Catholic church, but the matter seems so important that we think it best to speak of this dignitary in a chapter by itself. We have already given some of the reasons for believing that Christ never appointed Peter as the head of the Church (see under questions 9-12), but here we shall aim to give fully the proof which the Romish church offers and then show by the Scriptures that she fails entirely in proving the point. The question with the proof is the following:

4. What office did Christ confer on Peter alone?

Christ conferred on Peter alone the office of Supreme Head of His Church.

"Thou art Peter (a rock), and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in Heaven." — St. Matt. xvi. 18, 19.

"Feed My lambs, feed My sheep." — St. John xxi. 15-17.

The passage as here quoted reads a little different from the Authorized or the Revised Version, the versions used by the Protestant churches. The reason is that the Catholic church uses her own translation of the

Bible, made from a Latin translation called the Vulgate. Her version differs very much from our own and in many cases is very imperfect. In the above passage, however, the difference is not at all material. But it should be remembered all along that when we quote proof for the church of Rome, it is always from her own Bible.

If now there were nothing else in Scriptures concerning the foundation upon which the Church rests than what we have here, then it would certainly seem that Christ did build His Church upon Peter. The words here are so plain that we could not get away from that apparent sense. But there are other passages which speak of the foundation of the Church and we must also look at them and see what all the passages mean when taken together. This is the only correct way to interpret the Scriptures. One can prove almost any doctrine from the Bible by taking a passage here and one there, rending them from their connection. We must compare passage with passage so that what is not clear in one may get light from another.

Peter's original name was Simon, but when Jesus first accepted him as one of His disciples He gave him the name of Peter, which is the Greek word for rock. John 1, 42. Jesus gave him this name because He saw in him certain strong elements of character.

The occasion now when the above proof-passage was uttered was when Jesus asked His disciples whom they thought Him to be. Peter had always been the spokesman for the twelve and so too upon this occasion he was the first to speak, saying, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." It was in reply to this answer that Jesus uttered the above words. This connec-

tion of Jesus' reply leads us to believe at once that what Jesus had in mind was not the external government of the Church and that Peter as an individual and in his person should become the head of that government, but that He was here thinking of the doctrine or truth and the faith which lays hold upon that truth — that these are the foundation upon which the Church, that is, the real Church or the "Communion of Saints," should rest. In other words, Jesus is here speaking of the Church as a spiritual body of which He himself is the head, and not of the external organization of the Church. This passage does therefore not at all apply as proof that Peter is the visible head of the Church, since Christ is not speaking at all of the visible side of the Church.

That this is the correct interpretation of "rock" is seen also from other passages. Paul says, "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Christ Jesus". 1 Cor. 3, 11. Paul is here writing to the Corinthians concerning the doctrine of truth which he and others had preached unto them. But that doctrine or preaching, as he tells us elsewhere, was "Jesus Christ and him crucified". 1 Cor. 2, 2. Consequently the foundation upon which the Church was founded in Corinth was the true doctrine concerning Christ, really, the person of Christ, the very same thing which Peter confessed in the proof-passage under consideration.

We may consider another passage: "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord". Eph. 2,

19-21. If Paul were thinking here of persons as being the foundation, then it would not be Peter alone but also all the other apostles; nor even all the apostle only, but also all the prophets. But Paul is not thinking at all of persons as constituting a foundation, except in the case of Christ himself, but he has in mind the truth for which these persons stood and which they preached. "And came and preached peace unto you". Eph. 2, 17. This truth, this doctrine, this preaching which was of Christ and Him crucified, who is the very cornerstone of the Church — this is the foundation upon which the Church rests. And that Paul is not speaking here of any outward organization of the Church is as plain as daylight.

The Bible nowhere, in speaking of the foundation of the Church, concerns itself about the outward organization of the Church. That in most respects may assume one form or another and at the most pertains to the Church only as she appears in this world. It is a matter which is left entirely to the Church herself as to what is proper and best under differing conditions.* The Scriptures therefore say very little about it. The all-important thing is the spiritual side and foundation of the Church.

As further proof the following passages may be studied: "Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste". Isa. 28, 16. "Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, pre-

* The parable of new wine in new bottles supports this view.

cious stones, wood, hay, stubble". I Cor. 2, 12. "Wherefore also it is contained in the Scripture, Behold, I lay in Sion a chief corner stone, elect, precious: and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded. I Pet. 2, 6. This is the same passage as above from Isaiah, but it is interesting to know that Peter himself, whom Rome represents as the foundation, here declares that the foundation is Christ.

We may conclude by saying that the notion that Christ would make use of any man as the foundation of His Church, in any proper sense whatever, is so ridiculous that one can hardly conceive how men with sane minds can give it any serious thought at all.

We pass on now to the consideration of the second proof, namely, that Christ gave to Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven. Here again, if there were no other passages bearing on this subject, we would be compelled to believe that Peter had the sole control of those keys, whatever the keys themselves might signify. The first thing to do here is to determine the meaning of the "keys of the kingdom of heaven".

Rome speaks on this as follows:

"Now, the power of the keys denotes supreme authority. Thus: 'I will lay the key of the house of David upon his shoulder; and he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut and none shall open.' (Is. xxII. 22.) This was prophesied of Christ, who says of himself: 'Thus saith the Holy One and the true one: he that hath the key of David; he that openeth and no man shutteth; shutteth, and no man openeth.' (Apoc. iii. 7.) Consequently, when he said to Peter: 'To thee I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in

heaven' (Matt. xvi. 19.), He evidently communicated to him this supreme authority in 'the house of David,' i. e., in the Church, appointing him his vicegerent on earth."

Concerning the above passage taken from Isaiah it is stated correctly that it refers to Christ. But when that passage, as it appears again in Revelations (Apoc. 3, 7), is studied in its proper connection we find that the "key" spoken of pertains only to spiritual authority and not at all to temporal authority or to the external affairs of the Church. The Romish church, of course, includes spiritual authority in the power of the key; but what we want to show first of all, both in this and in the preceding passage, is that neither passage refers to the external organization of the Church and that therefore no such external power as is actually claimed for the pope could have been given him by these words of the Savior.

But that is not all. In fact, the given explanation does not remove the difficulty. If the authority and the power of the keys is only spiritual, it still leaves Peter the head of the Church in the most important sense. What we need to look for then in the second place is, whether these keys were given to Peter exclusively, or also and equally as well to all the other apostles.

Here now we find that Rome shrewdly ignores the passages which are against her. In Matt. 18, 15-22, the conversation is plainly about the forgiveness of sins, hence about the spiritual power of the keys. Here the person who has sinned and will not repent is to be reported to the church, that is, the local congregation: "And if he neglect to heart them, tell it unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee

as an heathen man and a publican". That the person is not to be reported to the pope, not even to the priest alone, is quite evident. For before he is reported to the congregation he is dealt with by two or three members of the congregation, of which committee the priest or pastor need not be a member at all. Then if he is still impenitent he is to be brought before the entire congregation and not before the priest alone as the representative or subordinate of the pope. There is therefore not the least intimation here of pope or priest rule in the congregation.

Next follow these conclusive words of Jesus: "Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven". The words "loose" and "bind" can refer to nothing else in this connection than forgiving and retaining sin. For in the preceding verses Jesus speaks of the man who has been cited before the congregation; if he repents, he is to be forgiven; if he does not repent, his sins are to be retained. The force of the words "loose" and "bind" is the same as that of the word "keys", for the only way to heaven for a man is to forgive his sins and the way to close heaven against him is to retain his sins. But this twofold power of the above passage was not given to Peter alone but expressly to all the apostles; or better yet, it was given to all the believers, that is, to the Church.

But Jesus continues the above conversation thus: "Again I say unto you, That if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven". Jesus does not say that one of these must be Peter or a bishop or a priest, but any two believers, as the words

following plainly show: "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them". If now Jesus is present with two or three believers who are assembled in His name, then that little congregation has all the authority and power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven and can forgive and retain sins and they need no commission from pope, bishop, nor priest. For we must not forget that Jesus is here speaking of the power to forgive and to retain sin; and He here expressly declares that such power belongs to all who are gathered together in His name and not to the pope alone.

We refer, however, to still another passage which Rome passes by: "And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained". Here again Jesus speaks of the spiritual power of the Church to forgive and to retain sins; He does so here in plain words, whereas in the two preceding passages He used figurative language, the "keys" and again "binding" and "loosing". But here He once more declares that both the Holy Ghost and the power to forgive and retain sins were given to all the apostles alike and not to Peter only.

What we have thus given should, we believe, suffice to show that the chief passage which Rome uses to prove that Peter was placed at the head of the Church does not prove her position at all. Peter upon that occasion as upon some other occasions, acted as spokesman for all the disciples and with that understanding Jesus in turn spoke to him; and the power and authority

therefore which He committed to Peter were intended for all.

The Romish catechism however adds another proof passage, namely: "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep," taken from John 21, 15-17.

In "Perry's Instructions" the following question with its answer is added:

Why was greater love exacted from Peter than from the rest?

Because a greater responsibility was entrusted; for Christ made him the shepherd of his entire flock — of both sheep and lambs, i. e., of both clergy and laity — he made him the one shepherd of his one fold, i. e., the chief Pastor of his Church."

The unheard-of explanation that the lambs are the laity and the sheep the clergy is nothing but a dream of the pope by which he divides the Church into the two classes, the priests, who are the rulers, and the people, who are the ruled. The people are very properly classed as lambs, for they must certainly play the part of lambs under their masters.

But why did Jesus address these words to Peter alone upon this occasion? The explanation is easy. Peter had denied his Master three times in a most heartless and wicked manner. Jesus had not yet said anything to Peter about the matter; but here now, in order to test him and learn whether he was penitent and could again be restored, Jesus by His threefold question, "Lovest thou me?" reminds him of that threefold denial and leads him to see his sin as never before and to repent. Being assured of his repentance and humility, Jesus restores him again to His favor and to his apostle-

ship by saying, "Feed my sheep, fed my lambs". Jesus said this to Peter alone because he was the only one who needed it. He no more meant that Peter should do all the feeding or be chief pastor, that he should do all the locking and unlocking, than when He gave him the keys of the kingdom of heaven.

In "Perry's Instructions" still other proofs are given to show that Christ made Peter the pope:

> When Satan desired to have the Apostles in his power, in order to prevent the overthrow of his kingdom, our Lord said to Peter: "Simon, Simon, Satan hath desired to have you that he may sift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not, and thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren." (Luke xxii. 31, 32. Why thus secure Peter only? and why leave and commission him to confirm the rest?

To the question, "Why thus secure Peter only?" that is, against the temptation that was coming, our answer is, Because he was in the greatest danger. On account of his natural boldness and high opinion of his own strength he was strongly inclined to be too fast in making promises. Right upon this occasion, directly in answer to the above words of Jesus, Peter was quick to say, "Lord, I am ready to go with thee, both into prison and into death." But Peter promised more than he could do as every one knows. Jesus well knew this weakness of Peter, therefore He prayed for him in particular. Satan was after all the disciples to sift them all as wheat, for the pronoun "you" above is plural; but Peter was the one most likely to fall and on account of his leading position among the twelve his fall would be the most hurtful.

As to the second question, "Why leave and commission him to confirm the rest?" our answer is that be-

cause of his strong character, after he was once fully converted, he would be the best fitted to strengthen the other disciples. That in a group of twelve men there should be one who is stronger than the rest and a sort of natural leader among them is nothing at all unusual; nor is it strange that Jesus recognized that fact and accorded to Peter certain special duties toward the others. But it certainly does not in the least follow from this that Peter was the chief of the twelve and the head of the Church. For this there would have to be an express command and that we do not have, neither here nor elsewhere. Nothing more can be inferred from the above incident than that Peter was the first among equals.

In Perry's Instructions" the following is given as a further proof:

"In the lists of the Apostles given in the Gospel, Peter is always put first, and he is expressly styled the first: 'The names of the twelve Apostles are these: The first, Simon who is called Peter.' (Matt. x. 2.)"

This proof like the preceding is worth nothing by itself or taken with others of a like nature. It would be of value only if somewhere there were an express word of Jesus that Peter was made the head of the Church. Since, however, there is no such instruction anywhere in the word of God, the above means nothing more than that Peter was recognized as in certain respects the leader among the twelve, the first among equals, just as Judas on account of his betrayal is always placed last in the list.

The fact that Peter acted as spokesman or head of the assembly when Matthias was chosen as successor to

Judas (I Acts 1, 15-22), is given as a further proof that he was appointed the head of the Church. Rome would do much better if she did not use this proof at all, for it is strongly against her. Peter had always been the spokesman among the twelve and naturally he was the one to begin the proceedings upon this occasion. But now notice this fact; not only the eleven were here, but also quite a number of others, "about an hundred and twenty", some of them quite probably women. If Peter now had been the real head of the assembly, would he not of his own authority have appointed a successor to Judas, doing nothing more at least than conferring with the other apostles? But he did nothing of the kind. On the contrary "they", the assembly, appointed two candidates and then they gave forth their lots and Matthias was chosen. Aside from making his speech, Peter, it appears, had no more to do with the transaction than the rest. He did not even lay his hands upon Matthias and consecrate him to his holy office.

Rome seeks additional proof for her figment about Peter in claiming that Peter acted as the head "in opening the first Council at Jerusalem, saying: Men, brethren, you know that in former days, God made choice among us, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel, and believe," etc., etc. (Acts xv, 7.)

In the first place there is no evidence here at all that Peter opened this the first Church Council. On the contrary we are told expressly that there was much disputing before Peter arose to speak: "And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up and said unto them," etc. The fact is that there is nothing in the account itself which shows just who presided at this meeting.

Other sources, however, would seem to indicate that not Peter but James stood at the head of the church in Jerusalem at this time. For example, compare chapter 12, 17, where Peter in announcing his deliverance from prison says, "Go, show these things unto James and to the brethren."

According to the Romish way of reasoning, that he who is mentioned first is the chief, James must now have been at the head of the church in Jerusalem. If Peter was chief pastor of the church, what he did according to the words following does not seem at all fitting: "And he departed, and went into another place".

The last evidence that we shall examine is the following: Peter's successors have invariably exercised this office from his time to the present day."

This statement we deny absolutely. So far as the Scripture record goes Rome herself can find no other proof for her claim than the two instances already given, the choice of Judas' successor and the first council. But neither one affords any proof that Peter was pope. In all the rest of the Acts and in all the Epistles and in Revelation there is not a word, nor even a hint, that Peter was the head of the Church. This would otherwise be strange indeed. If Christ had made Peter chief pastor of the Church, then the other apostles must have known it. Certainly too in their letters to the different churches they would have referred to the fact. But not a word anywhere. Paul refers to Peter in his letter to the Galatians, but primarily only to rebuke him for a serious act of weakness of which he was guilty (Gal. 2, 9-14), a thing which was hardly proper, if Peter was pope. In this connection Paul also mentions James and John (v. 9), but unfortunately places James first, thus, accord-

ing to Rome's way of reasoning, making James a more important figure in the church at Jerusalem than Peter.

The Roman Catholic church, of course, claims that Peter was the head of the church at Rome. There is no certain proof that Peter ever was in the church at Rome, at least not up to the time of Paul's death. If Peter had been at Rome and head of the church there, Paul, it would seem, certainly would have mentioned him and sent greetings to him as he did to others, when he wrote his letter to the church at Rome. And again, when Paul was prisoner at Rome for a number of years and sent letters from there to other churches, he certainly would have made mention of Peter. But not a word in either case.

2. The Pope's Infallibility.

On the infallibility of the Roman Catholic church and of the pope we have the following:

28. Why is the true Church called infallible?

The true Church of Christ is called infallible because she cannot err in matters of faith and morals.

"The Church of God, the pillar and ground of Truth."—I Tim. iii. 15.

Here Rome claims that she is infallible whenever she speaks concerning matters of faith and morals. We here again see how much is made of the authority of the Church. When she speaks, she always utters the truth and every one must obey. When you ask Romanists why they believe and do so or so in religious matters, they say that the Church says so. That is their final authority and ends the matter so far as they are concerned. But if you ask a Lutheran, for example, why he

believes and does certain religious things, he tells you that God's word says so. That is the great difference on this point between a Roman Catholic and a true Protestant.

But is there no truth in what Rome claims in the above explanation? The above passage from Timothy does not mean that the Church is the source of truth so that we might expect revelations from the Church. The only source of divine truth is the Bible, the word of God. The Church may teach only what is in that word, adding nothing and taking nothing from it (see under ques. 23).

The Church is the "pillar and ground of truth" because she is the only institution which constantly bears witness to the truth of God's word. If it were not for the Church this divine truth would soon be lost to the world. The Church continues this testimony because the Holy Spirit who is the Spirit of truth has been given her and He is ever in her midst, keeping her and guiding her.

But the Romish Catholic church misinterprets the above passage from Timothy. She, of course, claims that she is that church of which the apostle speaks. But the apostle does not mean the Romish church, nor any visible church or denomination; he means the Christian Church at large which is found wherever there are true believers; she is the ground and pillar of truth because the Holy Spirit is always in her midst testifying through the Word.

But this gives us no absolute assurance that everything that is claimed as the teaching of the Church is true. Jesus himself tells us that the wheat and the tares

are together in this world. Matt. 13, 24-30. Again, He says that we are to beware of false prophets who come to us in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Matt. 7, 15. Paul said to the Ephesians, "For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." Acts 20, 29-30. If all who claim membership in the Church were true believers in every respect and accepted all the truth, then the Church's testimony would always be true. But all do not accept all the truth and therefore we can accept only such testimony as agrees with God's Word.

But the Church does not speak as the Church. The Church is a body of believers and this body must speak through some one person or persons. Hence the following question:

29. By whom are infallible decisions given in matters of faith and morals?

They are given by General Councils approved by the Pope, or by the Pope alone speaking ex cathedra?

30. What do you mean by speaking *ex cathedra?*

I mean when the Pope, as Pastor and Teacher of all the faithful, decides for the whole Church, in a matter of faith or of morals.

There you have the whole abominable doctrine, that the pope, who in some instances during the Middle Ages was an ignorant and immoral wretch, has the authority to decide for the whole Church whether a certain doctrine is true or not true, or whether a certain moral act is right or not right. If there were no other evidence than the above monstrous claim, this were enough to

show that the whole Romish system is not of the truth but of the Father of lies. That men of intelligence can be so duped as to sell their own right of judgment and even their own conscience to such a system is next to unbelievable.

In "Perry's Instructions" there is a still fuller and clearer explanation of the claim:

What is the faith of Catholics in regard to the Infallible Teaching office of the Pope?

It is a defined article of the Catholic faith that "the Roman Pontif when he speaks *ex cathedra;* that is (1), when in the exercise of his office as of Pastor and Teacher of all Christians; and, (2), in virtue of his supreme apostolical authority he defines a doctrine of faith or morals to be held by the universal Church: he possesses, through the Divine assistance promised to him in the Blessed Peter, that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer wished his Church to be endowed in defining doctrines of faith and morals."

The following proof is then offered:

"All the passages adduced in regard to the teaching office of the Church and the primacy of Peter prove this. Therein Peter is declared to have the keys of the kingdom of Christ; he is said to be pastor of the whole fold, sheep and lambs, pastor and people. He is said to be the foundation of the Church, which is the pillar and ground of the truth. If the whole fold cannot err, much less can the pastor, who has the keys or charge. If the pillar and ground of truth divinely established cannot be 'prevailed against,' much less can its foundation."

We have already examined all the passages by means of which Rome seeks to prove that Christ made Peter the head of the Church and gave to him alone the keys of the kingdom of heaven and have found that they prove

nothing of the kind. Hence, too, according to Rome's own reasoning, they do not prove that the pope is infallible. In the catechism the following additional proof is given:

31. To what is this infallibility due?

This infallibility is due to the assistance of the Holy Ghost, as promised by Christ.

"I will ask the Father, and He shall give you another Paraclete, that He may abide with you for ever." — St. John xiv. 16; "But when He, the Spirit of Truth is come, He will teach you all truth." — St. John xvi. 13.

This would be good proof if it had been spoken to Peter alone, but unfortunately for Rome — fortunately for the Church, however — the above promise of the Spirit was made equally to all the apostles and not to Peter alone. Nor was it made only to the apostles, but to all believers. Proof of this we have in what took place on the day of Pentecost when the Holy Spirit was given to all the believers and not to the apostles alone.

But aside from all this the Holy Spirit will lead only such into the truth and keep them in the truth as obey the truth, whether pope, priest, or layman. When, therefore, the church of Rome stubbornly resists the Word of God as she has done in many instances and is still doing, then she can no longer lay claim to the guidance of the Holy Ghost.

We have seen a number of these instances already and we shall see still others. Here we give but one additional. The Romish church forbids priests to marry, but Paul classes this with the command to abstain from meats as doctrines of devils when he says, "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some

shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created and to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth." I Tim. 4, 1-3. Evidently these words of the apostle were spoken expressly for the purpose of guarding us against such false claims as the above made by the church of Rome.

Finally, it is strange indeed that the infallibility of the pope was not discovered until the eleventh century. If the popes are infallible, why not so from the beginning? And why did the Holy Spirit not make it plain from the first that the popes speaking *ex cathedra* could make no mistakes? Peter was married, for example, and he never put away his wife when he, as Rome claims, became the head of the Church. In the first centuries all the bishops and priests married and it was not considered sinful. Peter himself after he was pope, according to Romish claim, made a serious mistake and was sharply taken to task for it by Paul, his subordinate. Gal. 2, 11-14. Are we to suppose that the Lord did not want the popes of the first centuries to know that they were infallible? Or did the Lord himself discover only later — though even to think such a thing would be blasphemy — that it would be well to make the popes infallible? These and other questions suggest themselves in view of the fact that it was not until the year 1870 A. D. that the decree was finally issued that the popes always speak the truth *ex cathedra.*

THE PRIESTHOOD.

We have seen that Rome makes very much of the external organization of the Church; we have seen that the pope is the visible head of the Church, that he is infallible when he speaks *ex cathedra;* we have seen likewise that under the pope are the bishops and under the bishops ar the priests and that these different orders constitute the ruling class in the Church. This ruling body we may call the priesthood according to the Romish idea; and of this class we must say something more yet in particular.

In the pope's catchism under the subject, "The Church in General," we find the following:

2. How did Christ establish His Church?

He appointed St. Peter and the other Apostles His representatives on earth, and conferred on them a power similar to His own, that through their ministry all men might be saved.

"Peace be to you. As the Father hath sent Me, so I also send you." — St. John xx. 21.

3. What office did Christ give the Apostles in conferring this power on them?

Christ gave His Apostles —

1. The office of Teachers, to preach His doctrine;

2. The office of Priests, to administer the Sacraments;

3. The office of Pastors, to guide and rule the faithful.

"All power is given to Me in Heaven and on Earth. Going therefore, teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and the Holy Ghost.

Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." — St. Matt. xxviii. 18-20.

"Do this in commemoration of me." — St. Luke xxii. 19.

It is quite evident from the above passages that Christ did commit unto His Church the above powers; to preach, to administer the sacraments and to rule and guide the Church. We might quote many additional passages; in "Perry's Instructions" quite a number more are given. But as there is no dispute on that point, let the above suffice.

This, however, is the question, Did Christ confer these powers upon the apostles and their successors alone, on a special class or order in the Church; or did He confer them upon the whole Church and hence upon all the members of the Church?

This is a very important distinction. No one can have a clear understanding of the character of the Romish church and of the manner of its working; nor of a Protestant church, for example, the Lutheran, unless he is clear on this point.

Rome holds that Christ originally conferred the above powers only upon the apostles and that by them they were transmitted to their successors, the pope, the bishops and the priests (see questions 13-16 under The Church). In that way Rome gets the two classes within the Church, the ruling order and class, or the priesthood; and the class that is ruled, the laity or the common people. The passages quoted above and others which might be given certainly would, if there were no others, show this view to be the correct one. But Rome here, as in many other instances, takes only such passages as serve her purpose and passes the rest by.

We Protestants believe that Christ did not confer the powers spoken of above upon the apostles and their successors, the ministry, alone as a distinct class or order, but upon the entire Church and hence upon all the believers or members of the Church. In the Protestant church, therefore, as in the Lutheran, for example, we do not teach that there are two classes, the ministry and the laity. It is true, we use those terms and in a sense there are these two classes, but not at all in the Romish sense. This is shown already by the fact that the pastor is appointed or called by the congregation; the powers which the pastor exercises in the congregation were conferred upon him by the congregation. But if the congregation conferred them upon the minister, it itself must have had them, for no one can give to another what he himself does not possess. A Lutheran congregation therefore calls the minister and confers upon him the powers which he is to exercise in its midst; tells him, in fact, just what he is to do; everything, of course, according to Christ's word and command. There is nothing like that in the Romish church. The congregation has nothing to say as to who is to be its priest and as to what he is to do in its midst. The bishop of the diocese attends to all that.

But what is our proof over against the passages quoted above? In the first place, there are passages which clearly teach the universal priesthood, that is, that all true believers and therefore all members of the Church are priests and that there are no classes nor orders as to rank or authority. In I Pet. 2, 5, we read: "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house,

an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ".

Again in verse 9 of the same chapter he says: "But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvelous light".

St. John (Rev. 5. 10) in speaking of the work of Christ says, "And hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth".

These passages all speak of all true believers and hence of all the Church, not of a certain class or order within the Church. Here all are called priests and all are alike called upon to offer up unto God those spiritual sacrifices which are pleasing to Him.

Jesus himself expressely tells us that there are to be no orders nor classes among us with reference to authority or power: "But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master [teacher], even Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father upon earth; for one is your Father which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters; for one is your Master, even Christ." Matt. 23, 8-10.

In the Romish church both the pope is called Father, "Our Holy Father," and also the priest is honored with that title, as Father so and so of the ———— Church.

The matter becomes plainer, however, when we are introduced into the actual working of the Church or of the congregation as set forth in the New Testament. There we can see who exercised the powers and just how these powers were exercised.

We shall quote at length here a passage which we have already used: "Moreover, if thy brother shall

trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican. Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. Again I say unto you, That if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." Matt. 18, 15-20.

Christ is here speaking of a local congregation. He is supposing a case of church discipline. A man who has committed a wrong against a fellow brother in the congregation refuses to confess his wrong and to repent after having been spoken to, first, by the person wronged alone, secondly, by the person wronged in company with one or two other brethren. Now the offending brother is reported to the congregation and he is asked to appear before the entire body of believers. But here, too, he refuses to acknowledge his wrong and to ask forgiveness. After having done all that could be done to win the erring brother, but finding him hardened and impenitent, the congregation finally excludes him from its membership.

Now mark what was done. If the man had repented, then he would have been forgiven; that would have been exercising the loosing key. But he did not

repent and of course the loosing key could not be used. But since he did not repent the binding key was applied, that is, his sins were retained and he was put out of the congregation.

This now is one of those powers or functions which Rome claims was given to the priesthood alone; that is, not the congregation is to forgive the sins of a man when he repents, nor exclude him if he does not repent, but the priest is to do that. Yet here in the case which Christ supposes these very powers are exercised by the congregation.

That Christ did not mean here that one of the apostles or a successor of the apostles should exercise this authority is made plain in verse nineteen where He says that whatever any two agree to do on earth it shall be done for them in heaven. He is not thinking of the apostles only nor of ministers, for ordinarily there are not two ministers or priests in one congregation; but He has in mind all believers. That is made still plainer in the next verse where He says expressly that where any two or three are gathered in His name He will be there to work with them.

The above passage, together with its proper explanation, makes it quite plain that, in the case of a member who has sinned, not the pastor alone, but the entire congregation must decide either to retain or exclude the erring brother according as he repents or does not repent.

As to the public preaching of the Word and the administration of the sacraments, the Bible certainly teaches that these things are to be done only by such as have been properly called and appointed to the work. But the point here is this that, after the apostles who

were appointed directly by the Lord himself, these pastors were appointed by the churches or congregations themselves; that is, the Holy Spirit called them through the congregations and not through some pope or bishop.

THE WORK OF CHRIST.

In reality all we intend to say on the subject of Christ's work will be said under the Sacrament of Penance, especially under the subdivisions "Satisfaction" and "Indulgences".

However, Rome's view of the work of Christ is not only so peculiar in several respects, but also so at variance with what the Scriptures say on the subject that we deem it best to present the matter here also under its own proper head. Yet we shall do no more than give and repeat a few quotations from the Romish Catholic catechism and from the Bible. The needful explanations will be found elsewhere, as indicated above.

Under the "Fourth Article of the Creed" we have the following:

8. For what sins did Jesus make satisfaction?

Jesus made satisfaction for original sin and all the other sins of mankind.

If Rome said nothing to limit or contradict the above words then all would be clear, but under "Indulgences" we find this:

70. From what source do indulgences draw their power and efficacy?

From the treasury of the abundant merits of Jesus Christ and of the Saints.

If, in accordance with these words, one obtains remission of sins by indulgences, and if that power is

drawn in part from the merits of the saints, then evidently the atoning death of Christ does not suffice for man's salavation.

The thing is brought out more fully in "Perry's Instructions":

But have we *any* means of offering an adequate satisfaction?

Yes; we have the expiatory merits of Christ, which God is pleased to accept in our favor; but then, with His satisfaction, we must join our OWN penitential works. By this means we can supply, and more than supply, our own insufficiency, because the merits of Christ are infinite.

Here we are told that the merits of Christ are infinite, but we are also again told that we must add our own works before we can be saved.

The only explanation we can find for Rome's holding to this manifest contradiction is that, despite the complete atoning power of Christ's death, she is going to hold fast to the necessity of human works as in part a satisfaction for sin, *in order to maintain the power of the priesthood and to give the church something to traffic in.**

Over against these claims of Rome we place the following declarations of God's Holy Word:

"Behold, the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world." John 1, 29.

"There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." Rom. 8, 1.

"But now apart from the law a righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God through faith in

* That is fine and absolutely true.

Christ Jesus unto all them that believe; for there is no distinction; for all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God; being jutified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, in his blood, to show his righteousness because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God; for the showing, I say, of his righteousness at this present season: that he might himself be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus." Rom. 3, 21-26.

"But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being justified by his blood, shall we be saved from the wrath of God through him. For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved by his life; and not only so, but we also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the reconciliation." Rom. 5, 8-11.

"For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died; and he died for all, that they that live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who for their sakes died and rose again. . . . Wherefore if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new. But all things are of God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses, and having committed unto us the word of reconciliation." 2 Cor. 5, 14-19.

Let these passages suffice. They all state expressly, each in its own way, that Christ's death for us is a complete satisfaction for all our sins, and there is nowhere the least intimation that we must do something additional — add our own works to the merits of Christ — in order to assure ourselves of God's forgiveness and of eternal salvation.

THE RULE OF FAITH.

From what we have already said about the Church and the pope it must be plain that for Roman Catholics the Church is the great teacher and the final authority for everything that one is to believe and do. The people need look for no other authority; what the Church says, that they must believe and do. For that reason we spoke of the Church and the pope first, for they are the main thing in the whole Roman Catholic system.

It is otherwise in the case of true Protestants. For them the main thing is the Word of God, or the Holy Scriptures. That is their final authority and must in every case decide what one must believe and do to be saved.

We shall now compare these two rules of faith, the Church for the Romanists, and the Scriptures for Protestants. We shall speak first of the Bible and then of Tradition which Rome holds as of equal authority with the Holy Scriptures.

1. The Scriptures.

On the subject of faith the catechism leads up to the following question:

7. How has the revelation of God come down to us?

The revelation of God has come down to use partly in writing and partly by word of mouth;

In writing — that is, by the Holy Scripture or the Bible;

By word of mouth — that is, by Tradition.

Note. — Holy Scripture means holy writing, and is, therefore, often called Holy Writ. Tradition comprises not only the revealed truths which were never committed to writing, but those also which, though not found in the Bible, were afterwards preserved in writing. The former may be called, by way of distinction, oral Tradition, and the latter written Tradition.

14. Is it enough to believe only what is contained in Holy Scripture?

No; we must also believe Tradition; that is, those revealed Truths which the Apostles preached but did not commit to writing.

Rome teaches expressly that the Bible is not a sufficient revelation of divine truth and therefore not a sufficient guide in all matters of faith and morals. Right on this point we find one of the greatest differences between th Roman Catholic church and Protestants, especially Lutherans. One of the two great principles upon which the Reformation of the sixteenth century was fought out is that the Bible is the only rule of faith and life. The Papal church opposed that doctrine then and she opposes it today. We need therefore to study this question carefully.

As the catechism does not give the reasons why the Bible is not considered a sufficient rule of faith, we turn to "Perry's Instructions," where three chief grounds are given: first, that the rule is not plain:

The Protestant Rule of taking the Scripture alone is not *plain*, nor suited to the capacity of mankind generally. It is most *unsuited* to those who *cannot read;* how many such were there, especially in the earlier ages? for there was no printing till more than 1,400 years after Christ. It is *not suited* to those who *can* read, but have not judgment to under stand, etc. . . .

And how many are there who can understand the sense of the Scriptures? That the number of such is vastly great, is evident from plain fact; for we see that those who have not the Catholic Church to guide them disagree, etc The Scripture itself says, it is "hard to be understood," and "wrested by the unlearned and unstable to their own destruction." (Pet. iii. 15.) Therefore the Protestant rule is not plain; but it is a most difficult and dangerous rule.

On the other hand, nothing could be more plain, more easy and more suited to the capacity of mankind generally than the Catholic rule. Those who cannot read can listen to instruction; those who can read, but have not capacity to judge of the sense, can understand what they are to believe, when it is expounded to them. This rule is in accordance with the words of Christ: "Go and *teach* all nations; . . . *teaching* them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you." (Matt. xxviii. 19.)

The first reason given here to show that the Scriptures are not plain is that they are unsuited to those who cannot read. This is certainly a very good reason for the Romanists among whom there are so many who cannot read nor write. For example, in Spain there are 51 per cent. who cannot read, in Italy 48 per cent., in Portgual 75, and so on in about all purely Roman Catholic countries. The reason is of no consequence at all among Protestant where practically all can read. The thing to do, of course, is to teach people to read, not only to read the Bible, but also to read other books. It is nothing less than a crime against men and against society to keep this education from them. And it is plainly a sin against God and His Word to keep people in ignorance and then accuse the Bible of being unsuited to them because they cannot read. How men who want to pass for Christian gentlemen and for men of intelligence, even of infallibility, can make use of such silly and trivial argu-

ments in so serious a matter is beyond our comprehension. The Romanists themselves publish books and papers for their people to read. "Perry's Instructions" is a pretentious volume of over four hundred pages and they certainly expect their people to read it. Why not have them read the Bible? There must be some other reason than that many people cannot read and what it is we shall see later.

That the Bible is intended to be read by all the people is evident from the very fact that the Holy Spirit had all the things of the Bible put in writing. If it had been God's plan that only the learned and the teachers should have the Word, then it would not have been necessary to give such an extended revelation and to restate things in so many different ways. But God wanted a book that every one could read and understand and every one be interested in and therefore He gave us a book of all sorts of literature: history, biography, poetry, letters and the like.

But there are passages which plainly show that the Bible is to be used by all. We should note the fact right here, too, that the Romanists do not give a single passage to prove that the Bible is not meant for the people. Of course, there is no such passage. But the Lord said to Israel, "And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart: and thou shalt teach them dilligently unto thy children." Deut. 6, 6-7. These words were not spoken to the priests but to the parents. But if the parents were to teach them to their children, they themselves must have known them and been able to read the law.

In the first Psalm we read: "Blessed . . . but his delight is in the law of the Lord; and in his law doth

he meditate day and night." This again is not said of a priest, but of any man who does these things. And how can a man meditate in the law of God unless he reads it or has read it and become familiar with it?

In Psalm nineteen we read: "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple: the statutes of the Lord or right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes." How, we ask, can any one experience all these powers of the Word of God without reading and studying it? And if any one says that the Psalmist is here speaking only of himself and of other learned men, then we say that such a person is not dealing honestly with the Word of God. There is not the least intimation here nor anywhere else to that effect.

Jesus said expressly, "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me." John 5, 39. Note well that Jesus said this to the people, not to His disciples only. Note also what is implied concerning the people, namely, that they thought that they could find eternal life in the Scriptures and that Jesus did not say that they were mistaken and that the Scriptures were "dangerous".

Concerning the Bereans we read: "These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so." Acts 17, 1. These people were not satisfied simply to hear the apostles preach as Rome says the common people should be, but they wanted to read and see for themselves and they were commended for what they did.

Of Timothy Paul says, "And that from a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." 2 Tim. 3, 15. Timothy was carefully instructed in the Scriptures from childhood up, not by a priest, not even by his father, for his father was a Greek, but by his godly mother and grandmother. 2 Tim. 1, 5.

We could quote still other passages, but these should suffice to show that Rome's claim that the Bible is not intended for the people is both a silly and wicked assertion.

The other reason which Rome gives for keeping the Bible from the people is that the book is difficult to understand and is really dangerous to place in the hands of the common people. What a serious mistake Jesus made when He said, "Search the Scriptures." He should have said, Do not use the Bible yourselves, just listen to your teachers and do as they tell you.

Here now Rome was able to find one passage as proof and by garbling it made it serve her purpose. It is 2 Pet. 3, 15-16: "And account that the long suffering of our Lord is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto you; as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction".

If this entire passage were quoted in "Perry's Instructions" one would not be mislead by it. As it is given, however, one is lead to think that *all* Scripture is hard to be understood, whereas Peter speaks only of *certain things in Paul's letters.* This is a bird of alto-

gether different plumage. That there are some things hard to understand, all through the Bible, is not denied, but they do not happen to be the things which every one needs to know for his salvation.

The other misinterpretation above pertains to "the unlearned and unstable." Who are meant? honest, simple-minded people, though not especially educated? Not at all. Peter had in view men of perverted minds and of wicked intentions. They may even be learned in things of the world, but unlearned in divine truth and as to the requirements of the Christian religion. He describes them at length in chapter two, verses 12-15: "But these, as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things that they understand not; and shall utterly perish in their own corruption; and shall receive the reward of unrighteousness, as they that count it pleasure to riot in the day time. Spots they are and blemishes, sporting themselves with their own deceivings while they feast with you; having eyes full of adultery, and that cannot cease from sin; beguiling unstable souls: an heart they have exercised with covetous practices; cursed children; which have forsaken the right way, and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam the son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness." That such desperate characters will likely wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction is quite probable. But that the church of Rome, which claims to be infallibly guided by the Holy Spirit, should class our common simple folk, who are earnestly and sincerely seeking to do the Lord's will, with a set of men such as Peter here describes, is again next to unbelievable. Have these Romanists no conscience, or are their minds so befogged by the devil that they cannot see? It makes

our blood boil to see such willful perversion of God's holy word.*

That the Scriptures are intended for the common people and that they accept and understand them more readily than the great and learned is settled by Jesus himself when He says, "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father; for so it semed good in thy sight." Matt. 11, 25-26.

That the things of the Gospel are accepted more readily by the common people than by the great and learned is shown also by Paul when he says, "For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many nobles, are called: but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are: that no flesh should glory in his presence." I Cor. 1, 26-29.

Furthermore, all the passages given above to show that the Bible is intended for all people prove at the same time that it can be understood by all. For why should the Lord encourage the people to read Holy Scriptures, if they could not understand them, if they were even "dangerous" to their salvation?

Simply as a matter of fact, too, the history of the Church all along shows that it is not the common people with their childlike faith who have most perverted the

* It stirs the manhood in me.

Scriptures, but those who rather boasted of their own learning and wisdom; and all the perversion in Rome came not from the common people, but from her learned and "infallible" heads.

The reader also noticed above that the Romanists lay much stress upon Christ's command: "Go and Teach all nations". That is, Rome claims that she teaches the people instead of simply placing the Bible in their hands as we Protestants do. Can any charge be manifestly more unfair? Does not every one who is acquainted with the conditions know that the Protestants teach the Scriptures ten times more than the Romists? Any observer can see that a Romish service is made up mostly of ceremonies and the reading of the mass, which is in a language that the people do not understand; while in a Luthran service by far the greater part is devoted to express teaching of the Word of God, in a language, too, that every child can understand.

The second chief reason Rome gives why the Bible is not a sufficient rule of faith is that the Scripture is not a *universal* rule:

> The Protestant Rule of taking the *Scripture alone* is not a *universal* Rule — it does not contain *all* revealed truths. For, first, it commands not the first, but the seventh day of the week, to be kept holy (Gen. ii. 2, 3; Exod. xx. 8-11); secondly, it forbids the eating of blood, etc. (Acts xv. 28, 29); thirdly, the authenticity, truth, and inspiration of Scripture, are the very foundation of the Protestant Rule — the faith of the Protestants rest entirely upon these facts; and yet they cannot be learned from the Scripture alone. Therefore, Scripture alone is not a universal Rule.

We have already spoken in part on the above point, that the Bible does not contain all revealed divine truth

(see under question 23, under "The Church"). We shall also be obliged to speak of it again in connection with "Tradition." We shall accordingly make only a few statements here to refute what is said above.

First, it is said that there is no command in the Scriptures that we are to keep the first day of the week instead of the last as was done by the Jews. That is correct. The Lord did not want to give any such command. He wanted the Church under the guidance of the Spirit to choose her own day. And that the Church chose the first day of the week may be plainly gathered from the Scriptures themselves without outside sources. Let any one carefully read and compare the following passages and see whether there is not clear proof there that the first day of the week was observed as a special day of worship: John 20, 19-23; John 20, 26-29; Acts 20, 7; I Cor. 16, 2; Rev. 1, 10.

On the other hand, that the Church is not obliged to keep the seventh day is clearly stated by Paul: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." Col. 2, 16-17. We might remark in this connection that Paul in the above passage likewise forbids judging in regard to meats. Rome, however, forbids her people the use of certain kinds of meat on certain days, a command which she gets outside the Bible, but plainly contrary to the Bible.

Futhermore, Rome says above that the Bible forbids the use of blood. The correct interpretation of the passage referred to, Acts 15, 28-29, shows that those restrictions, excepting the one against fornication, were meant only for the Gentile converts and only for them

for a time. Sins are there referred to which were especially prevalent among the Gentiles and which converts from among them would be greatly tempted to practice even after they had become Christians. As to the use of blood, that was not considered wrong by the apostles, but its use was offensive to the Jewish Christians and hence the Gentile converts were asked to abstain from it. If the apostles would have meant to forbid it absolutely, then their command would have come in direct conflict with what Paul says above, not to allow any one to judge us in regard to meat. And again, if the above were meant as an absolute prohibition of the use of blood, then again Rome by allowing its use would have found a privilege outside of the Bible directly contrary to the Bible. We accordingly must again express our surprise at the shallow, trivial and inconsistent thinking and reasoning of the Romanists. One expects better things from infallible teachers.

Rome makes the further claim above that the authenticity, integrity, truth and inspiration of the Scriptures cannot be gathered from the Scriptures themselves. Our answer is that we have, right in the Scriptures themselves, all the proof we need; and furthermore that the Scripture proof on the subject is the only infallible proof there is. To discuss this subject fully would require more space than we can give it here; nor do we deem a full discussion necessary. The Bible claims to be the Word of God, to be the truth, to be inspried, to be the rule by which all doctrine must be tried. We give only the following passages. Some of them have already been quoted:

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for

instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. 3, 16-17.

"Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scriptures is of any private interpretation. For the prophesy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Pet. 1, 20-21.

"Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me." John 5, 39.

"To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Is. 8, 20.

In regard to proof on any of the above points taken from sources outside of the Scriptures, we can use that evidence and do use it just as well as Roman Catholics. We want to know, for example, all that the church fathers said about the Bible as God's Word and we give their sayings all the weight they deserve. The radical difference is here that we do not look upon any of their statements as infallible and as of equal authority with the Scriptures. We take them only for what they are worth.

We may add yet in this connection that the absolute personal assurance and conviction that the Bible is God's word cannot be gained, neither from statements of the Bible itself, much less from statements outside of the Bible, but from the testimony of the Holy Spirit in one's own soul. If one is humble and prayefully studies the Bible, accepts its teachings and tries to live them, then he will soon come to see and be sure that the Bible is the everlasting word of the Lord.

The third chief reason why the Scriptures are not a sufficient rule of faith is that they are not a *certain Rule:*

> The Protestant Rule of taking the *Scripture alone,* is not a *certain Rule.* The *true sense* is, as far as it goes; but, first, "the unlearned wrest it to their own destruction" (2 Pet. iii. 16); secondly, the most learned disagree about the sense of it; thirdly, even the same persons alter their opinions; "being carried to and fro by every wind of doctrine" (Eph. iv. 14); fourthly, the whole Catholic Church is against their interpretation! What security, then, can they have in their Rule? For, in its application, it is attended with nothing but difficulty, uncertainty and doubt.

Here it is said that the true sense of the Scriptures is a certain rule "as far as it goes." Here the Romish notion that the Scriptures do not contain all revealed truth crops out again. We shall speak of that false claim under "Tradition." Of the assertion that the unlearned wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction we have spoken already (see under the claim that the Bible is not "plain".) Then we are told that even the learned disagree as to the sense of Scripture. One is moved here to ask for what sort of people the Scriptures were given. On the one hand, we are told that it is dangerous to place the Bible in the hands of the unlearned, on the other, that the learned cannot agree upon it. Who else is there? We had occasion to notice above that in purely Catholic countries the people are largely unlearned and if the learned also cannot be trusted with the Bible then there seems to be no one left but the — "infallible" few.

The passage (Eph. 4, 14) referred to above proves entirely too much for Rome: "That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and

cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive." Paul is speaking here of the danger to every one of being carried away from the truth if he is not careful. But he includes himself, "we." The pope, then, and the other "infallible" teachers in Rome must be greater even than Paul was. Paul recognized the danger even for himself, but for Rome's elect masters there is no danger.

It is further stated above that the "whole Catholic Church is against" the interpretation of the Scriptures as given by Protestants — for that seems to be the meaning of the phrase. That, of course, is no proof of the correctness of the Papal position. We simply answer by saying that the whole Protestant world is against the Papal interpretation.

Notice the last statement in the above quotation from "Perry's Instructions," that the application of the Protestant rule is "attended with nothing but difficulty, uncertainty and doubt." What a monstrous assertion! To place the Bible in the hands of a man of ordinary intelligence can result in nothing but difficulties and uncertanties and doubts as to what the Lord wants him to believe and do! How did young Timothy who sat at the feet of his mother and grandmother ever get his knowledge of divine truth? How muddled those Bereans must have become who searched the Scriptures for themselves! What a blunder Jesus made when He said, "Search the Scriptures"! For common sense and reliability these "infallible" teachers of Rome certainly "take the cake!"

Rome boasts very much of the unity prevailing in her midst, while "among Protestants scarcely can two persons agree in their belief." We do not know to what extent there is real unity among the Romanists, but we can easily account for any unity there found. In our

school days it was customary in learning the alphabet for the teacher to say "a" and then the pupil said "a". The teacher next said "b" and then the pupil said "b". Then the teacher said "c" and the pupil said "c". So the teaching went on day after day until the pupil had learned the alphabet. That is Romes system. The pope says "a", then the bishops say "a", then the priests say "a", and then finally the people say "a". So with the whole alphabet of divine truth. In that way the people get their knowledge — what they get at all. There can be no other way, for the Bible, as we have seen, is a dangerous book.

Nor is that all. When the pope has said "a", then everybody else must likewise say "a". If any one tries to say "b" or "c", he is promptly excommunicated. If any teacher, for example, among the Romanists teaches contrary to the fixed doctrines of the church, he is either compelled to retract, or else he is expelled from the church. Thus Luther in his day was excommunicated. That is the way Rome preserves her unity and that is the sort of unity she possesses. It is simply believing what the priest or the church says and because the church says it. There need be no inner conviction, no testimony of the Spirit, that we are the sons of God. From such a unity and faith we pray to be delivered.

2. Tradition.

14. Is it enough to believe only what is contained in Holy Scripture?

No; we must also believe Tradition; that is those revealed truths which the Apostles preached but did not commit to writing.

"But there are also many other things which Jesus did, which if they were written every one, the world itself, I think, would not be able to contain the books that should be written." — St. John xxi. 25.

Therefore, brethren, stand fast; and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word or by Epistle." — II Thess. ii. 14.

15. Why must we believe Tradition as well as Holy Scripture?

Because Catholic Tradition and Holy Scripture were alike revealed by God.

"And teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." — St. Matt. xxxviii. 20.

16. What then must a Christian believe?

A Christian must believe all that God has revealed and the Catholic Church teaches, whether it is contained in Holy Scripture or not.

First of all, we shall need to examine the claim that Christ or the apostles anywhere commanded the Church to hold fast to "Tradition,' that is, to teachings which have come down through centuries, but which are not contained in the Holy Scriptures.

The passage, John 21, 25, is not at all to the point. That Jesus uttered many words which were never committed to writing is, of course, evident, but there is not a word here that any of those sayings have been handed down and that they must be accepted as of equal authority with the Scriptures. There are such reputed sayings of Jesus, but there is no sufficient certainty that any of them are genuine. Rome, of course, has many such, some of them very silly stories about Jesus' childhood, but the slightest comparison with the Scriptures shows that they are mythical.

Quite a number of Scripture passages are used by Rome to prove her doctrine of tradition. It would take up too much space to examine all of them carefully; nor is it necessary. We shall examine only the two strongest; if there is no conclusive evidence in them, there is none at all.

The first is 2 Thess. 2, 15, quoted above. This passage shows plainly that Paul imparted to the church at Thessalonica "traditions," that is, teachings both by letter and by mouth, that is, by direct oral teaching. That fact is self-evident. Paul established congregations to which he never afterwards addressed a letter. All their instruction they received from him by mouth. But that is no proof in the least that they received any other kind of traditions or teachings than the other churches. They certainly all received the same kind of teaching. Paul knew only one Gospel. Whatever variations may have been made were due to outward conditions and did not pertain at all to the real substance of his message. If Rome means by traditions such things, things that are not at all essential or things that were only of a local character, then we do not object; she may claim such traditions. But Rome does not mean that. She makes some of her traditions very essential, even necessary unto salvation. But it would simply be ridiculous to suppose that Paul delivered some such traditions to one church, but not to another. Hence we know that those churches to which Paul sent no letters nevertheless received the whole message of the Gospel; nothing needful was omitted.

Furthermore, in regard to the churches to which Paul did address epistles, it is evident that he did not

aim to put the whole message of the Gospel in the epistle. For example, in the letter to the Galatians not a word is said about the Lord's Supper and nothing expressly about the resurrection of Christ; in the letter to the Thessalonians nothing is said about baptism nor about the Lord's Supper and very little about faith, forgiveness of sins and justification. Similar things are true of all the shorter epistles. The fact is that about all the epistles were written to instruct the churches only in certain doctrines, or to correct certain abuses which had crept in, or to warn against certain heresies. It is quite evident, therefore, that in every church there was more or less instruction given which was not included in the letter written to that particular church.

But this brings us now to the real point at issue. Is there any valid evidence that the apostles imparted teachings to any church that are not contained in one or the other epistle, or in the Acts, or in the four Gospels? The above passage from Thessalonians does not prove it in the least. All it shows is that Paul taught the Thessalonians some things by mouth which were not included in his two letters to them. There is not the least proof that he taught them some things which were not contained, either in his other letters or in some other book of the Bible.

The above passage therefore proves nothing for Rome. The only way in which she can carry her point is to show conclusively from other sources than the Bible that the apostles did deliver such traditions, but that she has failed to do. Her doctrine about tradition, therefore, like many of her other claims, proves in the light of God's Word to be but a dream.

The second strongest passage which Rome quotes is 2 Tim. ii. 2: "And the things which thou hast heard of me by many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men who shall be fit to teach others also." This passage is found in "Perry's Instructions". The new thing in this passage is that Timothy should commit what he heard from Paul to other teachers and, we may say also, to his successors in office. But after all, this passage resolves tiself into the same question as the preceding, namely, what did Timothy receive from Paul? It must be answered likewise in the same way, namely, that there is no proof here whatever that Timothy received anything from Paul which is not contained in his letters or in other writings of the Bible.

To make her doctrine concerning traditions seem plausible Rome charges Protestants with holding many traditionary doctrines: "Indeed, Protestants themselves believe many traditionary doctrines; as, for example, the lawfulness of keeping holy the Sunday instead of Saturday, of eating blood and things strangled, of infant baptism, the inspiration and canon of the Scriptures, etc." (Perry's Instructions).

All the above items except infant baptism have already been considered under the topic that the Scriptures are not a "universal" rule. We there found that the matters in question are amply explained and proved in the Scriptures themselves. The same is true of infant baptism. In our own catechism — Luther's Ohio Edition — we give five chief reasons for believing in infant baptism and every one of them is taken directly from the Scriptures. There is not a shred of traditionary evidence in the whole of Lutheran teaching. When Rome makes such charges as the above she is either betraying

woeful ignorance or else is wilfully misrepresenting others.

This whole question of tradition resolves itself simply into this: Either these traditionary doctrines are such as are already contained in the Scriptures, in which case we do not need them; or else they are doctrines different from or contrary to the Scriptures, in which case we do not want them. As a matter of fact Rome's traditions are of the second class. We do not undertake to say what all her traditionary doctrines are. There is no doubt of this, however, that whatever she cannot prove from Scriptures, she calles in tradition to help out. Among such doctrines we may class enforced celibacy of priests, withholding the cup from the laity, worshipping the host, the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, Infallibility of the Pope, praying to the saints and still others.* We are not certain whether Rome supports every one of these only by tradition or not; but we are absolutely certain that each and every one is contrary to the Scriptures.

* There is not a single passage of Scriptures that directly teaches one of these dogmas or doctrines. The boldest of Roman writers never appeal directly to the Scriptures in support of these doctrines, but only say that they are implied in a few passages of the word of God.

THE MEANS OF GRACE.

1. The Holy Scriptures.

In the preceding chapter we spoke of the Bible only as the revelation of divine truth. It is the word of God and shows us what God wants us to believe and do in order that we may be His true children and be saved in the end.

For Protestants and for Lutherans especially the word of God serves another important purpose. The word of God is for us a Means of Grace. That is, through the word of God the Holy Spirit leads us to a knowledge of the truth, to repentance and to faith, and imparts to us forgiveness of sins, righteousness, peace, the powers of a new life and final salvation. This is certainly making very much of the word of God. If that Word is the means by which we get all these things, then indeed it should be most precious to us. What proof have we that this is so? The following passages should satisfy us on this point:

"I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Rom. 1, 16.

"So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Rom. 10, 17.

"The preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God." I Cor. 1, 18.

"For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." I Cor. 1, 21.

"Being born again, not of corruptable seed, but of incorruptable, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." I Pet. 1, 23.

"For though you have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers: for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the Gospel." I Cor. 4, 15.

"Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first fruits of his creatures." Ja. 1, 18.

"If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." John 8, 31-32.

"Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you." John 15, 3.

"Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me." John 5, 39.

"And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark 16, 15-16.

To the above clear passages we add a few examples of what was done when the word of God was preached:

On the day of Pentecost (Acts 2) three thousand were brought to repentance and faith through the preaching of Peter and were added unto the Church.

When the believers were scattered abroad from Jerusalem on account of the first persecution, these people went "everywhere preaching the word," Acts 8, 4. In

the same connection it is said of Philip that he "went down to Samaria and preached Christ unto them".

Paul in all his work did nothing but preach the Gospel and in that way made believers and founded churches. He tells us expressly moreover: "For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel." I Cor. 1, 17.

The above evidence — and we might offer still more — shows conclusively that the word of God is a means of grace; that is, that it is God's design that through the use of the Word, whether by preaching, teaching, or reading, men are to come to a knowledge of the truth, see their sins and lost condition, repent, believe and be saved. And it is not only the means for bringing men to faith, but the means likewise for keeping them in the faith unto a blessed end. This among Protestants is the second great use of the Holy Scriptures, the first being to show what we are to believe and do to be saved. The first use shows us what we are to do and the second gives us the grace or power to do it.

Strange to say, now, in the pope's entire catechism we have not been able to find so much even as a hint at this second use of the Scriptures. Nowhere is it stated that the Scriptures are to be used to convert men. Rome sems to have no use for the Bible except as a revelation from God to show them what to do. But even for that it is not by any means enough as we have already seen abundantly, for she brings in her tradition to help her out and make the pope infallible. The result is, as anyone can see, that Romanists are not asked to believe what the Bible teaches, but what the church teaches and what the priest says. In that respect Rome is the lazy man's church; he does not need to trouble himself to find out

the truth for himself — does not need to search the Scriptures as Jesus says; all he needs to do is to ask the priest.

This is one reason why Rome has no interest in circulating the Scriptures among the people. The Bible cannot do them any good; grace is not imparted to them through the Word; in fact, she says the Bible is a "dangerous" book. This is not her chief reason for opposition to the Bible; we shall see what that is later, but in passing we also want to notice this disregard for the Holy Book.

But if the Roman Catholic church does not use the word of God as a means of grace, what means of grace has she? That point is cleared up by the following question under "The Means of Grace":

> 26. What special means must we use to obtain grace?
> **The Holy Sacraments and Prayer.**

The following question under "The Tenth Article of the Creed" and which pertains to the forgiveness of sins also applies here:

> 3. How are sins forgiven in the Catholic Church?
> **Sins are forgiven through the merits of Jesus Christ applied to the repentant sinner, chiefly in the Sacrament of Baptism and Penance.**

Both the above questions say exactly the same thing, for when it is said in the second that grace is applied "chiefly in the Sacrament of Baptism and Penance", reference is had to the other sacraments of the Romish church and not to the Word of God as a means of grace.

As to prayer, that is not a means of grace in the proper sense. We may receive grace in answer to prayer,

but the grace does not come through prayer. When the grace of God comes, it always comes through His own appointed means of grace which are the Word and the Sacraments. We agree, therefore, completely with Rome, when she says that the sacraments are means of grace, but we disagree just as completely when she says that they are the only means of grace. Her great error in this we have exposed sufficiently above. We, of course, also do not accept all the sacraments which Rome declares to be sacraments. But more of that later.

How shall we explain Rome's position then that all grace is imparted through the sacraments? She certainly did not take that position because of the teachings of the Scriptures, as was clearly seen above. She must have found that doctrine in her traditions. And here again she could not have used all tradition, because at no time was the Church more zealous and active in spreading the faith by means of preaching and teaching the Word of God than just in the first centuries. Rome found her doctrine concerning the means of grace only in certain traditions, in such, namely, as suited her purpose. That's the dangerous thing about traditions. What suits can be taken, what does not suit can be left. Rome has evidently made liberal use of that privilege.

But we ask again, why did Rome build up and fortify her peculiar doctrine concerning the means of grace? The chief answer is, because Rome is a sacerdotal church, that is, a church of priests. We have already seen how the people are not to learn the truth from the Bible, but from the church, that is, from the priests, the bishops and the pope. Just so, too, all grace is imparted through the same priests, or lords and masters. The layman may not administer the sacraments,

except baptism and possibly certain other sacraments, in exceptional cases. But aside from a few exceptional cases, all this work is in the hands of the priesthood. That is what Rome wants, complete authority and power over the people. The priesthood, from the pope down to the ordinary priest, rules the church. That certainly is priestcraft and is directly opposed to the teachings of the Bible.

Here we may see a reason also why Rome does not want to consider the Scriptures a means of grace. If they are a means of grace, then people can use the Scriptures and get God's grace without going to the priest; that is, it is possible for a man through the mere reading of the Bible and by the grace of the Holy Spirit to learn the truth, to repent and to believe in Christ. Such a person would, of course, want to receive still fuller instructions in the Word of God through some pastor and be baptized and unite with some local congregation. If such a person, however, were so situated that he could not secure the services of a pastor and died under such circumstances, we could nevertheless feel that he was saved, even though no priest nor pastor ministered to him.. He would be saved by God's grace and Spirit through the Word of God. But Rome does not want people to believe that they can be saved in that way; they must get forgiveness of sins and salvation through the priest. That rule gives her complete power over every one.

2. The Sacraments.

In the Lutheran church we speak of two means of grace, the Word of God and the Sacraments. In the preceding chapter we spoke of the Scriptures as a means

of grace. We now pass on to the sacraments. We might first speak of sacraments in general, but the difference between the two churches on this point will appear as we look at the sacraments themselves.

Here is Rome's definition of a sacrament:

1. What is a sacrament?

A Sacrament is an outward sign of inward grace, or a sacred and mysterious sign and ceremony ordained by Christ, by which grace is conveyed to our souls.

There can be little if any objection to this definition of a sacrament. It differs very little from the one given in our own catechism except that the latter is a little fuller and more specific. The following is the definition given in the catechism of the Joint Synod of Ohio, question 334:

"A sacrament is a holy rite instituted by Christ himself, whereby with visible means the treasures of the Gospel are offered, given and sealed to us."

In the Romish sacrament there are three essential things (question 3):

1. An outward sign;
2. An inward grace;
3. The institution of Christ.

In our own definition there are four points, but the first and third, "a holy rite" and "visible means", may be included under Rome's first point, "an outward sign."

However when we come to look at the number of sacraments we find that Rome counts seven while the Protestant church has but two. From this it is apparent at once that Rome, though her definition of a sacrament

is much like our own, must have an altogether different conception of the nature and use of sacraments.

If a sacrament were something that men or the Church could institute, then it might not matter if we did differ as to what sacraments are and how many there are; for as to mere human churchly arrangements the Scriptures nowhere teach that we must all have the same number and the same kind the world over. But both Rome and we teach that a rite, in order to be a sacrament, must have been instituted by Christ; not merely by the Church, nor by the apostles, nor by the pope, nor by any other person, but altogether and alone by Christ.

We must therefore examine the Scriptures to see just how many institutions or ordinances that Christ commanded are to be looked upon as sacraments and as binding upon the church.

Rome has the following sacraments:

7. How many Sacraments did Christ institute?

Christ instituted Seven Sacraments, namely: 1, Baptism; 2, Confirmation; 3, Holy Eucharist; 4, Penance; 5, Extreme Unction; 6, Holy Orders; 7, Matrimony.

Note. — The Catholic Church, the "pillar and ground of Truth," has taught so from the beginning, as is attested even by the sects, which in the first centuries separated themselves from her.

We agree with Rome that both Baptism and the Holy Eucharist or the Lord's Supper are sacraments. We therefore pass these two by, though later we shall come to speak again of the Holy Eucharist.

Taking the sacraments in the order given by Rome we have as the second:

1) *Confirmation.*

Of this ordinance Rome says:

1. What is Confirmation?

Confirmation is a sacrament in which, by the imposition of the Bishop's hands, anointing and prayer, those already baptized are strengthened by the Holy Ghost, stedfastly to profess their faith by word and deed.

2. How do we know that the Sacrament of Confirmation was instituted by Christ?

We know it from the teaching of the infallible Church, in accordance with the Holy Scriptures and the doctrine of the Early Fathers.

"They sent to them Peter and John, who prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost: for He was not yet come upon any one of them, but they were only baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Then they laid their hands upon them; and they received the Holy Ghost." — Acts viii. 15-17.

The Luthrean church uses the rite of Confirmation. Yet there were times and places when it was not generally observed; at the present, however, it seems to be quite generally used throughout the whole Lutheran church. But Confirmation was never looked upon as a sacrament through which divine grace is offered and imparted, but only as a churchly rite for receiving people who were baptized in infancy into full communion with the Church, that is, chiefly to give them the privilege of partaking of the blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

The rite is also quite generally looked upon as a renewal of the baptismal covenant on the part of the confirmed. They were baptized in infancy, when their parents or sponsors made the confession of faith and

promise of faithfulness for them, having attained to an age of understanding, they do this publicly for themselves in the act of Confirmation. That, in the Lutheran conception, Confirmation is closely associated with infant baptism is seen from this also that, when an unbaptized adult is received into fellowship with the Church, it is done through Baptism alone. Confirmation falls away as practically a meaningless rite in that case; for Baptism is the divinely appointed means or rite for receiving people into the communion of the Church.

Really, for Lutherans, the chief thing in Confirmation is not the rite itself but the preparation for the rite, that is, the instruction in the word of God, so that the confirmant may know just what God wants him to believe and do in order to be a faithful member of the Church, and may make an intelligent confession of his faith. Confirmation is therefore seen to be chiefly a confession of faith on the part of the confirmed; and since the Lord demands a confession of His name before men we may look upon Confirmation as providing a most appropriate means for such confession. We believe too that the rite of Confirmation, where properly observed, contributes to the spiritual welfare of the persons confirmed and indeed of the entire congregation; but we do not hold that any special gift of grace or of the Holy Spirit is imparted by the act.

But why do we not view Confirmation as a sacrament? Our answer is that there is no divine command to that effect. We do not look upon the passage used by Rome and quoted above as such a command.

The facts in the case are these: Philip, one of the seven deacons (Acts 6, 1-6), later also called "the Evangelist" (Acts 21, 8), upon the first persecution that broke out in Jerusalem, went up into Samaria and preached the Gospel; and when numbers of them repented and believed he baptized them. The news was soon brought to Jerusalem, where the twelve apostles were still abiding, that the Samaritans were receiving the word at the mouth of Philip. In order to impart additional gifts of grace to these new converts, to confirm them in the faith and to make them conscious of their spiritual fellowship and oneness of faith with the central congregation at Jerusalem, the apostles sent two of their number to confirm and complete the work which Philip had begun. They prayed for the converts and laid their hands upon them and these then received the Holy Ghost.

First, we need to notice that the gift received by these persons was, primarily at least, some special or extraordinary gift of the Spirit, the presence of which was noticable in some outward way. That there was some outward manifestation, such as speaking with tongues, may be known by this that Simon the Sorcerer at once saw that the gift of the Spirit was given by the laying on of hands and sought with money to purchase the same power. But these special gifts of the Spirit, such as the gifts of prophesy, of tongues, of healing and the like, soon ceased in the early Church, so that this act of the apostles here at Samaria cannot be considered an example or command for all time. For no one now expects by Confirmation or laying on of hands to confer any of these extraordinary gifts of the Spirit.

Secondly, it may be said that the Samaritans at the hands of the apostles received not only special gifts of the Spirit, but also the essential and ordinary gifts, such as repentance and faith. But whatever gifts of grace they may have received at the hands of the apostles, those persons must have received a goodly measure of these gifts already by the preaching and the Baptism of Philip, for no one can repent and believe and become a fit subject for Baptism except by the power of the Holy Ghost. Furthermore, there are cases of Baptism where there is no account of laying on of hands, as on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2, 41), the case of the Ethiopian (Acts 8, 38), the jailor at Philippi (Acts 16, 33). It will not do to say that the hands were always laid on in connection with Baptism or at some later time, but that in the cases cited the fact is not mentioned; for there is no command nor statement anywhere showing that this always had to be done or always was done; and therefore where the act is not mentioned we have no conclusive proof that it took place.

Thirdly, we find that even the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit were not always given in connection with the laying on of hands. In the case of Cornelius and his company (Acts 10, 44-48) we find that these gifts were bestowed even before Baptism took place and there is no mention of laying on of hands at all.

In the fourth place and chiefly, the proof passage which Rome cites contains no command, neither expressed nor implied, nor is there such a command elsewhere in the Scriptures, that the laying on of hands at or after Baptism must be done and that divine grace

is thereby imparted and that therefore the act called Confirmation thus becomes a sacrament.

In conclusion, we find that laying on of hands was done for various purposes: bestowal of blessings (Gen. 48, 14; Matt. 19, 13); laying the hand upon a victim to be sacrificed (Lev. 4, 4); for the purpose of healing (Mark 5, 23); imparting special gifts (I Tim. 4, 14); setting apart for special service (Deut. 34, 9; Acts 6, 6; Acts 13, 3).

There are many other instances in Scriptures of laying on of hands, but the above suffice to show the variety of purposes; and nowhere is it declared that the rite is something essential, that it is a sacrament and that it must always be observed. It is, however, a significant symbolical act and as such has always been used in the Church. But when Rome claims that laying on of hands in the act of Confirmation was considered a sacrament from the beginning she is saying more than is historically true, for Confirmation was not looked upon fully as a sacrament until about the thirteenth century.

2) *Penance.*

1. What is the Sacrament of Penance?

The Sacrament of Penance is a Sacrament in which the sins we have committed after Baptism are forgiven.

4. When did Christ institute the Sacrament of Penance?

Christ instituted the Sacrament of Penance when, after His Resurrection, He breathed on His Apostles and said: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." — St. John xx. 21, 23.

The Lutheran church, of course, also recognizes the above institution of Christ; inded, this is the greatest and most precious power which Christ has given to His Church, the power to forgive sins, for that is the gift and power which He here conferred on the Church through the apostles. We call it the "Office of the Keys," as Christ elsewhere designated it (Matt. 16, 19). We speak of it too as "Absolution", the power to absolve or loose from sin. However, we do not call it a sacrament, since, properly speaking, there is no visible means there, such as water in baptism or bread and wine in the Lord's Supper. Yet if Rome wants to call the Office of the Keys a sacrament, we do not object seriously. It is some of the things which she teaches about Penance that we must consider as especially erroneous and most hurtful.

a. One erroneous teaching of Rome, as we had occasion to notice already under "The Priesthood", is that this power to forgive sins was given only to the apostles and their successors in office, the bishops and priests.

5. Did Christ impart the power of forgiving sins to the Apostles only?

No; Christ imparted that power also to all who were to succeed the Apostles in the priesthood, as the Church has ever believed and taught.

However, we have already spoken fully of this false view under "The Pope" and "The Priesthood" and therefore pass it by here, except to mention it.

b. A second evil connected with Penance is the insistance on the part of Rome that the person making confession must mention and recite all his sins.

42. What is Confession?

Confession is the humble recital of our sins to a priest, to obtain his absolution?

44. When is a Confession *Entire?*

A Confession is Entire, when we confess at least all the mortal sins we can remember, together with their number and necessary circumstances.

In the first place, it is plain that before God we must confess all our sins, even such as we may not be conscious of. But we need not tell God the particulars of our sins, for He knows them better than we can tell Him.

It is furthermore plain that before our confessor, be he priest or pastor or any Christian brother, we may name any sins that may specially trouble us and for which we are then and there seeking the comfort of forgiveness. Indeed, the case may be such where it becomes necessary to mention the sin or sins for which one seeks forgiveness and to speak freely about them, otherwise the confessor cannot fully assure and comfort us. The confession which David made before Nathan (2 Sam. 12, 1-14) was such an instance; also the woman taken in adultry (John 8, 1-11); in Acts 19, 18, we read that at the preaching of the apostles "many that believed came, and confessed, and showed their deeds," for even, though they did this voluntarily, yet they were inwardly constrained to make the confession.

But there is nowhere any command that even this must be done in every case. Of the woman who was a sinner and whose sins Jesus forgave there is not a word that she mentioned her sins. Luke 7, 36-50. The

paralytic was forgiven and there is not a word of even a confession, though Jesus of course saw the penitence of his heart. Mark 2, 1-5. Much less is there a command that one must recite to the confessor all the sins which one can possibly recall and even in a way torture oneself with the fear that some sins may have been overlooked. St. James says, "Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed." Ch. 5, 16. But these words of the apostle can by no manner of means be made to say that we must name all our sins to one another. This passage furthermore affords proof that this confession need not always be made to a priest, for the apostle is here speaking to all, the bishops and people together, and admonishes them to confess to one another.

But the worst feature of this demand to confess to the priest only and to enumerate one's sins is the power that is thus placed in the hands of the priest. This power has been fearfully abused as the history of the Confessional shows. It is a powerful leverage in the hands of Rome to rule and exploit her people and it is a part of her systematic priestcraft.

c. Another error and abuse pertaining to the Office of the Keys is what Rome calls "Satisfaction."

59. What is Satisfaction in the Sacrament of Penance?

Satisfaction is doing the penance given by the Confessor.

60. Why does the Confessor give a penance?

The Confessor gives a penance — 1, That we may satisfy for the temporal punishment due to our sins; 2, That we may amend our life.

61. When God forgives the sin, does He not also remit the punishment due to that sin?

God always remits the enternal punishment, but not always the temporal punishment due to sin.

"Therefore Nathan the prophet said to David: The Lord also hath taken away thy sin; nevertheless for this thing, the child that is born to thee shall surely die."—2 Kings xii. 13, 14.

62. What is the temporal punishment due to our sins?

The temporal punishment due to our sins is that which we have to suffer either here on earth, or in Purgatory.

The real question here is not as to whether or not we often must suffer in this life for our sins even after they have been forgiven. We all readily concede that we do. It is a part of God's arrangement. However, we are to look upon such suffering, not so much as punishment for sin, by no means as punishment from an angry God, but as fatherly chastisement for our good, so that we may the more hate sin. The correction therefore has to do, not so much with the sin that was committed and is past, but with the sin of the future, that we may the more keep from it.

The pernicious thing, however, about this Satisfaction is the notion that men by such suffering really make satisfaction, that is, atone, if only in part, for their sins. This notion implies, as must be plain to any thoughtful mind, that Christ cannot have made full atonement for our sins and that there is something left for us to do completely to satisfy divine wrath.

On page 29 of the catechism, question 8, we have this:

For what sins did Jesus make satisfaction?

Jesus made satisfaction for original sin and all the other sins of mankind.

If these words were understood by Rome as we understand them, then no place would be left for satisfaction on man's part. So far as atonement for sin is concerned Christ has done all. But Rome does not understand those words in that sense, otherwise she would not be speaking elsewhere of the merit or satisfaction of human suffering or works.

In Perry's Instructions on Satisfaction we find these very clear words: The question is asked:

But have we *any* means of offering an adequate satisfaction?

Yes; we have the expaitory merits of Christ, which God is pleased to accept in our favor; but then, with His satisfaction, we must join our *own* penitential works. By this means we can supply, and more than supply, our own insufficiency, because the merits of Christ are infinite.

Note well what is said here. Christ's merits are said to be infinite. That should suffice for all our sins and for all punishment, both temporal and eternal. But Rome says, no. We must add our own penitential and meritorious works. Here then is where Rome enters her wedge to make room in the plan of salvation for all manner of human works and merits. Christ is our Savior, yet He is not our complete Savior; we ourselves must do something to complete the work. That's where the devil has made a nest for himself in the church of Rome right on the altar of the Lord.

But what about Rome's proof? She has not a jot nor title of proof to offer. The case of David which

is cited shows only that he had something to suffer for his sin after it was forgiven, but there is not a word that by such suffering he in any way made satisfaction for his sin, whether for eternal or for temporal punishment. In Perry's Instructions a number of other proofs are given: the punishment of Adam and Eve for their sin; Moses' exclusion from Canaan for his fault (Ex. 20, 7-12); David's punishment for his vanity in numbering his people (2 Sam. 24, 10-14). All these are instances of suffering on account of sin; there can be no question as to that; but not a word here nor elsewhere in the Scriptures that by such suffering the least satisfaction or atonement was made for sin in any shape or form. On the contrary, Jesus says expressly, "When ye shall have done all those things which were commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do." Luke 17-10. And Paul asks, "Who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again?" Rom. 11, 35.*

And as to the claim that Christ made atonement only for the eternal punishment of sin and not for temporal, that is simply another dream of Rome of which the Bible knows nothing at all. Against such a claim we place passages like these: "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." 1 John 1, 7. These words include not only all sin but also all the guilt of all sin. No other explanation does justice to the words. Again, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus." Rom. 8, 1. Those

* What is brought out in this paragraph is very important and well put.

who by faith are in Christ have forgiveness of all sin and of all guilt of all sin. That is what those words say to the simple upright believing heart. Besides, however we may explain the evil fruits of sin which we must often suffer in this life, even after the sin itself has been forgiven, whether we look upon it as a punishment or only as a means for correction, we can never in the face of Scripture look upon such suffering as some sort of an atonement for sin. The suffering is always intended for our good, but never to make satisfaction for any sin committed, nor to win God's favor.

Furthermore, Rome does not stop with the punishment which God himself sees fit to inflict for the chastisement of the sinner, but where the priest thinks that God has not inflicted any punishment or not enough, he proceeds to impose upon the guilty person such punishments as he deems necessary to make atonement for the sins committed. Is that not assuming a power which belongs to God alone? Where in the Bible is there a single instance of the Church in any way imposing punishment for sin upon a man who repented? The prophet Nathan laid no penance upon David; he simply by revelation from God told David what God would do to him. What was done was altogether God's act, not Nathan's.

In every case where a servant of God seemed to impose punishment for sin, it was an impenitent person whom he was dealing with. Such was the case of Ananias (Acts 5); also Elymas the sorcerer (Acts 13). Wherever persons repented, their sins were forgiven and not a word was said about any punishment as a satisfaction for sin.

That Rome is actually seeking to make satisfaction for sin and so to add to what Christ has done is seen also from the following:

64. Should we perform only that penance which the Confessor gives us?

We should also try to satisfy the Divine Justice by other voluntary works of penance, and by patience in our sufferings.

That we should bear patiently whatever the Lord is pleased to lay upon us is, of course, evident. The apostles especially admonish us to patience in all our suffering, but not a syllable anywhere that by so doing we are satisfying divine justice. It all belongs to Rome's system of works by which she deludes people into thinking that they must in a measure earn or merit their salvation, which conviction, furthermore, is an excellent leverage in the hands of the church to exploit the sinner and fill her own coffers.

d. Another abuse in the church of Rome in connection with Penance is the traffic in "Indulgences."

66. By what means does the Church help us to discharge the temporal punishment due to our sins?

By the grant of Indulgences.

67. What is an Indulgence?

An Indulgence is a remission of the temporal punishment due to our sins, which the Church grants outside the Sacrament of Penance.

69. From whom has the Catholic Church the power to grant Indulgences?

From Jesus Christ who said: "Whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed in heaven." — St. Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18.

70. From what source do Indulgences draw their power and efficacy?

From the treasury of the abundant merits of Jesus Christ and of the Saints.

We begin with the last question. That the merits of Christ are sufficient for all sin we believe. Rome, however, does not believe it, as was seen under "Satisfaction." Right here, too, she adds the merits of the saints to those of Christ. But where is Rome's proof that the saints had any merits, either for their own sins and much less for the sins of others? Rome herself does not offer any proof, neither in her catechism nor in the larger work of "Perry's Instructions." This notion of saint-merit is simply another dream that fits in nicely into her system of works in which she can traffic. If these saints, such as John the Baptist, the Virgin Mary and a host of others, many more modern, had more merits than they needed to make satisfaction for their own sins, these merits now make a nice depository upon which the church can draw for poor sinners who are not quite as good but who have the money to pay, or else are willing to do some good work. But can one well imagine anything more false and unscriptural than such a traffic in merits, even of the saints if they had any, much less in the merits of the most innocent and holy suffering and death of Christ? If it were not a fact one would say that it is impossible for any body of intelligent men to conceive of such an idea and then really believe it. But the thing is done right in Rome and taught as clearly as the sun shines in the day time. It is another example of how men become deluded when they refuse to be guided by the plain words of Scripture.

In speaking of indulgences we need first of all to get into the clear just what Rome means by "temporal punishment of sin." We are not to understand by temporal punishment of sin the natural consequences of sin, such as sickness, loss of property, loss of good name or character; these are natural fruits of sin over which Rome claims no control. By temporal punishment is meant, for one thing, that which the church imposes upon a person as a penance and for the purpose of making satisfaction for a sin whose guilt has been remitted. This penance may assume various forms; the person may be required to say a number of prayers or fast a certain length of time or give certain alms or pay a sum of money or undergo some hardships as a punishment .

That a church *may* impose such pennance upon members for sins committed no one probably will question. It is one of those external things in which the Church may act as she deems best. Such penances may even prove helpful, if imposed only for the purpose of leading the person to a deeper sense of his sin and to fuller repentance; but in no sense whatever can they be looked upon as a satisfaction for sin or as meriting God's mercy. But that the Church is *bound* to impose such penalties — for that there is no word of God whatever. Whatever penalties for sin are to be imposed, God himself imposes. The state or the civil power must impose penalties upon such as break its laws, but not the Church — not in the kingdom of grace. The only penalty which the Church may impose is to exclude a person from her fellowship, if he refuses to repent and turn from his sins. Matt. 18.

By temporal punishment due to sin Rome understands, furthermore, punishment which God himself inflicts. However, not the natural fruit of sin as when a man suffers pain for sticking his finger into the fire; Rome, we believe, claims no power over this form of punishment. But God may inflict other punishment of which, so far at least as man can see, there is no physical nor purely natural connection with the sin committed. A very plain and striking case is that of David in connection with his sin against Uriah. 2 Sam. 12. After the prophet Nathan had shown David his sin and David had made confession the prophet said, "The Lord also hath put away thy sin; thou shalt not die. Howbeit, because by this deed thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, the child also that is born unto thee shall surely die." We can see no physical nor natural connection between the sin of David and the death of that child; hence we can say that the Lord imposed the death of the child upon David as a special penalty for his sin. But where is the proof that the Church may, by such a thing as indulgence, remit or even to any degree lessen such punishment? Nathan spoke the word of pardon to David and thereby David's sin was forgiven, together with all its guilt and all eternal punishment. But as to temporal punishment — that was altogether in the hands of God; if He chose to inflict such punishment He could do so and, as we know, did do so. Nathan, however, had no power to remit it nor lessen it in any degree; nor is there any other example or proof in the Bible that the Church has such power. The only power the Church has is that of prayer; we may pray God to lessen the evil consequences of our

sins already in this world and doubtless He often hears and answers such prayers.

Rome holds that there is a third kind of punishment due to sin, also classed under temporal punishment. It is the punishment which God inflicts upon the departed in Purgatory. All the eternal punishment for sins has been remitted to souls in purgatory before they entered upon that state at death, but the amount of suffering they must undergo in that place of torture depends entirely upon the amount of sins which they had committed in this world and how far short they came of making full satisfaction in the world for all the temporal punishment* due their sins. Of Purgatory itself, however, which is another Romish dream, we shall speak elsewhere; nor will it be necessary here to say anything further about the bearing of indulgences upon the punishment of Purgatory, for if there is no Purgatory there can be no indulgence for souls in Purgatory.

What now is an indulgence? An indulgence is the remission on the part of the Church of all or a part of any of the three forms of temporal punishment spoken of above. As to the punishment in Purgatory, there is no such place. As to special punishment which God may inflict upon us for our sins, there is no proof whatever that the Church has any power at all over such punishment or chastisement, *except by prayer*. Here again then there can be no such thing as indulgence or remission on the part of the Church. As to the first form of

* Temporal punishment is punishment that has a termination. It is not eternal. Only temporal punishment is suffered in Purgatory. It is the intention, so Rome says, that the punishment of Purgatory shall end for all who enter there.

punishment, that which a church herself may impose, here as a matter of course the church may act, may impose or remit just as she pleases. But such an act, whether it be imposing a penalty or remitting a penalty already imposed, does not in the least change that person's relation to his God; nor will anything which that person may do or suffer at the behest of the church merit a single favor at the hand of God. It is purely a disciplinary measure, employed by the church, without divine command, but if properly done may be helpful in humbling the person and in working a more heartfelt repentance.

But what about the proof passage under question 69, "Whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed in heaven?" We have already examined this passage under the "Pope" and have found that it pertains only to the forgiveness and the retention of sin itself and not to the exercise of any external power or authority which the Church might have. To the Church is given the power to forgive sin. This forgiveness always carries with itself the full and free remission of all the guilt of the sins forgiven as also of all eternal punishment. As to temporal punishment, that must be left with our merciful Father in heaven. If our repentance is deep and we earnestly pray that He may not visit upon us all the temporal evils that we have deserved, He will doubtless hear our prayers. However, in this as in all things we must ever be ready to say, Thy will and not mine be done. We must be ready humbly and patiently to bear whatever the good Lord is pleased to lay upon us, knowing that He will never suffer us to be tempted above what we are able to bear. Any other indulgence that a church may offer here is worthless. The only things that

count in the sight of God are heartfelt repentance with amendment of life and earnest believing prayer.

On the contrary, indulgences can only work harmfully. That which an indulgence demands is always something external. Whether it be the repeating of a certain number of Pater Nosters or Ave Marias or any other form of prayer; or whether it be fasting for a number of days, performing certain works of mercy, or undergoing some physical hardships, as Luther often tortured himself — in every case it is something external and formal and can in no way merit God's mercy, that He should, for the sake of such works, remit any punishment which He sees fit to impose. Yet by these means poor deluded people are led to believe that they are doing good works and making satisfaction for thir sins and gaining God's favor. It is a sin and a shame so to delude souls and to prevent them from offering to God a truly spiritual sacrifice, a purely contrite and believing heart, trusting wholly in the mercy of God in Christ Jesus.

Another evil of indulgence, a sheer abomination in the sight of God, is the arrangement that they can be purchased with money. Not only is the thing itself to be abhorred, that a man can with money directly purchase God's favor, but it leads to abuses that can only be a curse to both the priesthood and the laity. It was this abuse of the Confessional in the days of Luther that especially moved him to nail up in public his Ninety-five Theses. He saw how the people's money was being filched from them and they themselves being deluded, that if they confessed their sins to the priest and then paid money for an indulgence they were quit from all temporal punishment.

There is another evil. It is not so easy for the ordinary layman and especially for the uneducated — of which, by the way, there are a great many in the Roman Catholic church — to distinguish between the remission of the temporal punishment of sins and the remission of sin itself. To us it looks as a very likely thing for such a person to conclude that by means of his indulgence he is getting forgiveness of sin itself; the more so since Rome has not always been careful to make this distinction clear to the people.

Here is the place to speak of another matter pertaining to indulgences. Rome confuses *penance* and *repentance*. In "Perry's Instructions" the following passages are quoted thus: "Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of penance". Luke 3, 1. "Except you do *penance*, you shall all likewise perish." Luke 13, 3-5. "Be converted, and do *penance* for all your iniquities, and iniquity shall not be your ruin." Ezek. 18, 30.

If the reader takes his Bible he will find that in each one of the above passages the word used is repent or repentance and not penance. We all know what repentance means and that there can be no forgiveness of sins without it. But penance is something altogether different. The chief thing about penance is to do some external act as a satisfaction for sin. With such instructions, how can one expect anything else than that the people will be lead to believe that their acts of penance are the necessary things unto salvation? Such things come from a faulty Bible translation.*

* A fitting conclusion to the above discussion are the words of St. Paul that "by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight" as being directly contrary to the above teachings of Rome.

3) *Extreme Unction.*

1. What is Extreme Unction?

Extreme Unction is a Sacrament, in which by the anointing with holy oil and by the prayers of the priests, the sick receive the grace of God for the good of their souls, and often also for their bodies.

Extreme Unction is the fifth of the Romish sacraments. If this rite were simply a churchly ceremony in which the chief thing is prayer, little if any serious objection could be had to it; but Rome makes it a real sacrament whereby the grace of God is imparted and sins forgiven. For that reason we shall need to examine it somewhat to see just what the Scriptures say about the matter. On the other hand, Rome does not look upon the sacrament as essential to salvation; after all, therefore, the case is not of extreme importance.

2. Whence do we know that the Sacrament of Extreme Unction was instituted by Christ?

We know this from the constant teaching of the Church and from Holy Scripture.

"Is any man sick among you, let him bring in the Priests of the Church and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and the Lord shall raise him up, and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him." — St. James v. 14, 15.

Here Rome appeals to the "constant teaching of the Church;" that is, from the times of the apostles on. But there was no such constant teaching. What we find is that in the early centuries of the Church a superstitious use of oil was made for the purpose of performing

miraculous cures. We are told that people even stole the lamps from the churches to use the oil they contained for miraculous healing. We read, too, of a Gnostic sect "that anointed the dying with a mixture of oil and water to protect them from hostile spirits in the other world." These facts show very plainly that at this time the anointing with oil was done in superstition, that the oil was expected to work results in some magical way, and that it was not done as by the command of Christ or the apostles and in faith and reliance upon His promise. Here the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia says, "This superstition was the germ of the subsequent sacramental idea of the Church. The transition is apparent in a letter of Innocent I (416) to Bishop Ducentius of Eugubium, which expressly calls anointing with oil a kind of sacrament." This idea was carried along and grew until finally the anointing came to be regarded as a sacrament. Yet, according to the above authority, the expressions "extreme unction" and "sacrament of the dying" do not occur until the twelfth century. Extereme Unction, then, like some more things in the Romish church, simply grew from little things — in this case partly out of superstitious practices — until it was finally declared by some council or pope to be of divine origin and therefore a sacrament.

But how about the above Scripture passage, is that not proof enough that this oiling is to be considered a sacrament? Let us examine it and see what we get.

For one thing, the passage shows very clearly that the object of the anointing and prayer was the sick person's recovery: "Faith shall save," that is, recover, "the sick man, and the Lord shall raise him up." Extreme Unction, on the other hand, is a preparation for death

and is not applied except where a sick person is expected to die. For such is the catchism answer to question 7:

When should we receive Extreme Unction?

We should receive Extreme Unction when we are in danger of death by sickness, but if possible, while we are yet conscious, and after the holy Viaticum.

In the second place, a comparison of the above passage with Mark 6, 13: "And they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them," shows that the apostle St. James had in mind either a common custom of that time of anointing the sick with oil, with or without prayer, or else miraculous healings. Miraculous healing, however, was not meant to be universal, that is, all the sick were not expected to be healed, otherwise there would have been no deaths among the believers. In some instances it is said that Jesus healed all the sick. Matt. 4, 24. But generally He healed only certain ones. At the pool of Bethesda there were a multitude that needed healing, but Jesus healed only th one impotent man. John 5, 1-9. Epaphroditus, Paul's fellow-worker, was sick "nigh unto death," yet there is no evidence that Paul healed him. Phil. 2, 25-27. Extreme Unction, however, is meant to be applied to every one who is sick nigh unto death and although the catechism says that the anointing heals "often also the bodies," yet the object is not a miraculous healing but preparation for death.

In the third place, the passage states expressly that it is not the oil that does the healing but the "prayer of faith"; that is, the chief thing is believing prayer. Since, on the one hand as was seen above, the oil was intended to be used, either according to a common custom or with

a view to miraculous healing; and since, on the other hand as we see here, prayer was the real remedy, it is easily seen how the use of oil in the case of sickness, after the gift of miraculous healing had disappeared from the Church, either readily ran into superstitious practices or else dropped out entirely. Prayer, on the other hand, can be applied to all cases of sickness, whether it be but an ordinary case of sickness or whether the person is in immediate danger of dying. It would mean then that when we make use of believing prayer in these cases of sickness, we are complying fully with what St. James intended and that there was no intention whatever of instituting a sacrament like Baptism or the Lord's Supper.

There is furthermore no proof that Jesus anywhere commanded His disciples to anoint the sick with oil. Mark 6, 13 only shows that the disciples sometimes used oil, but not that they were commanded to do so.

But what about the forgiveness of sins: "If he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him?" The sins spoken of cannot refer to the person's sinfulness in general, for why in that case say "if" as though it were a question whether he had any sins at all? All persons are sinful. No, the apostle means that if the person has committed certain sins on account of which he is especially troubled or possibly on account of which the sickness has come upon him, these shall be forgiven, though, of course, other sins likewise. This now is just what we expect. If a man is sick and we pray for him and the prayer is one of faith and the man himself is penitent and believes, his sins will certainly be forgiven, that is God's promise. Whether the person will recover bodily also, that remains alone with the Lord.

There is therefore nothing in this James passage that compels us to look upon this anointing as a sacrament, nor that it must be used at all. If the Church wants to use it and it is done in a proper way, without superstitious notions, there can be no objection. Of course there dare be no notion either that the rite is a thing good in itself, nor a thing that merits divine grace, nor that, accompanied by prayer, it will accomplish its purpose whether the person anointed is truly penitent and believes or not.*

4) *Holy Orders.*

Holy Orders in the Catholic church corresponds to Ordination of ministers in Protestant churches. Rome calls it a sacrament because there is an outward sign, the laying on of the hands, and the impartation of certain gifts of grace.

We do not call it a sacrament. For one thing there is no sufficient and clear proof that the ceremony was considered essential and that any special gifts of grace are imparted by the act. The strongest passage is that of I Tim. 4, 14: "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." Here the impartation of a gift is expressly mentioned as also the laying on of the hands of the elders of the church.

There are also other examples. That of the seven deacons who were set apart for the work of looking after the poor: "Whom they set before the apostles:

* Extreme Unction is often administered to persons who are unconscious. Faith cannot be there. The oil, the act, does the work.

and when they had prayed, they laid their hands upon them." Acts 6, 6. The case of Paul and Barnabas: "Then, when they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them, they sent them away." Acts 13, 3.

On the other hand, there is no proof that Jesus laid His hands on the eleven who were the very first to be sent out. At the ascension He "lifted up his hands, and blessed them." Luke 24, 50. On another occasion He "breathed on them and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Spirit." John 20, 22. But in neither case did He lay His hands upon them, and in the second case Thomas, one of the eleven, was not present at all. Nor is there any proof that the eleven laid their hands upon Matthias who was elected to the apostleship instead of Judas the traitor. Acts 1, 26.

Furthermore, there is nowhere any command, either expressed or implied, that the laying of hands on persons who are called to preach the Gospel must be done and that it is essential to the office. Inasmuch, too, as the laying on of hands was used for various purposes, not only for setting apart for some holy work or service, but also for imparting some extraordinary gift of the Spirit, for healing the sick and for still other things and yet the rite is nowhere commanded as necessary, it is best to look upon Ordination only as an appropriate church ceremony by which the Church publicly attests that the person ordained has been properly called to preach the Gospel, and by means of which also, by the scripture reading and prayer connected therewith, the Church solemnly sends the person forth with her blessing to the work to which he has been called.

Rome, however, not only calls Holy Orders a sacrament, but also connects with it certain things that are

objectionable and therefore we must give the subject some further consideration.

4. What is the Sacrament of Holy Orders?

Holy Orders is a sacrament, which confers on those who receive it the powers of the Priesthood, together with a special grace to discharge faithfully its sacred duties.

One of the errors of Rome relative to Ordination is that only persons who have been ordained may or can perform priestly acts. A layman in the Romish church may not confess his sins to another layman and receive the comfort of forgiveness from him; he must go to the priest. The priest alone by virtue of his ordination or consecration may or can do this. This belongs to the Romish system that the priesthood is an order in the Church, in very character different and distinct from the laymen. But for a fuller discussion of this point, see especially under "Priesthood".

Another error is the notion that Holy Orders confers upon the person consecrated an indelible character or condition of holiness.

7. Can a Priest lose the sacred character received in his Ordination?

A Priest can never lose the sacred character recceived in his Ordination; for Holy Orders, like Baptism, imprints an indelible mark on the soul.

The mischievous thing here is that this supposed "sacred character," like the office of priesthood itself, places the priests in a class by themselves with a special mark or kind of holiness to which the ordinary believer cannot attain. But there is nothing in the Bible to show

that priests or ministers of the Gospel are, simply because of their office, any better in the sight of God than the most ordinary member of their flocks. Any superior holiness on their part depends entirely upon how they personally receive the grace of God, upon how they use their office and upon their manner of life in general.

It is especially misleading to teach that such a "sacred character" cannot be lost. The grace of God does not stick in that way. Paul speaks of this expressly when he says, "But I buffet my body and bring it into bondage: lest by any means, after that I have preached to others, I myself should be rejected." I Cor. 9, 27. One wonders when reading of the scandalous life attributed to the priesthood, for example, at the time of the Reformation and, according to report, even now yet in certain countries, what becomes of that sacred and indelible character. However, all these things are helpful in conferring upon the priesthood in the eyes of the people a certain awe and authority which can be used in domineering over them.

5) Ma*trimony.*

Matrimony is the last of Rome's seven sacraments. In the light of Scripture it is so plain that matrimony or marriage is not properly a sacrament that not much needs to be said.

1. What is the Sacrament of Matrimony?

Matrimony is a Sacrament by which two single persons, a man and a woman, are joined together in marriage, and receive grace from God to fulfill faithfully until death the duties of their state.

2. When was Matrimony instituted?

Matrimony was instituted in Paradise by God Himself; our divine Savior raised it to the dignity of a sacrament. "This is a great Sacrament, but I speak in Christ and in the Church." — Eph. v. 32.

In the above claims the following things are true:

That marriage was instituted by God.

That it was instituted in Paradise.

That God will give those who trust in Him and love and serve Him grace to fulfill their marriage vow.

But that Christ elevated matrimony to the dignity of a sacrament and that it therefore is a sacrament — for that there is no word of God whatever, for the passage quoted above is not applicable at all. In that passage Paul does not call marriage a "sacrament" but a "mystery". "Sacrament" is again a faulty translation of which there are very many in the Catholic Bible. The Greek word is "mystery"; and both the Authorized and the Revised Versions render it "mystery"; there certainly can, therefore, be no mistake.

But what the Bible does not prove that Rome proves by her church councils. Her catechism does not go that far, but "Perry's Instructions" furnishes the proof: "If any one saith (says the Council of Trent) that Matrimony is not truly and properly one of the seven Sacraments of the Evangelical Law instituted by Christ our Lord, . . . and that it does not confer grace let him be anathema."

There you have it. Accept what the church, in this case, the Council, says or else be anathema, that is, accursed, damned.

Perry, however, in order to make it appear that Matrimony as a sacrament was instituted by Christ,

appeals to what Christ said in Matt. 19, 4-6: "He who made man from the beginning, made them male and female, . . . and they two shall be one flesh; therefore now they are *not two*, but *one flesh*. What, therefore, God hath joined together, let no man put asunder".

But Jesus adds not a single thing here to the ordinance of marriage as originally given in the garden of Eden; for what He says in "what God hath joined together, let no man put asunder" was all contained in the words spoken in Paradise. Not a thing did Jesus add nor change. Marriage was a most holy ordinance from the beginning, but it was no sacrament then and it is no sacrament now.

In one way, however, it is an advantage to call Matrimony a sacrament; it may give the bond a more sacred aspect in the eyes of some and so be helpful in moving them to observe its holy requirements more faithfully. On the other hand, Matrimony being considered a sacrament which, of course, the priest alone can administer,* there is given the Church another leverage with which to domineer over the people.

---

* The consummation of marriage is the act of the contracting parties. There is and can be no sacrament unless the parties themselves complete the union by living as husband and wife. Hence the reality of the sacrament, if sacrament there be, depends not on the priest but on the parties themselves. This vitiates Rome's position as the administrator of the sacrament by the priest alone.

Furthermore, over against the divine word, "Whom God hath joined together, let no man put asunder," the priest immediately separates by the hearing of confession.

6) *The Holy Eucharist.*

The Eucharist is the third in the list of Romish sacraments, but on account of its great importance we have left its consideration for the last.

1. What is the Holy Eucharist?

The Holy Eucharist is a Sacrament in which the true Body and true Blood of Jesus Christ are substantially present under the appearances of bread and wine, for the nourishment of our souls.

This definition shows that the Roman Catholic church, like the Lutheran, believes what is usually called "The Real Presence"; that is, that in the Eucharist or Lord's Supper Christ gives His true and real body and His true and real blood to all who receive the Sacrament. There is therefore no difference between us on this point.

The first great difference appears when we come to speak of the manner of the presence of Christ's body and blood in and with the bread and wine. Notice that in the above definition it is said that the body and blood of Christ are present under the "appearances of bread and wine." That is, Rome claims that the substance of the bread and wine are changed into the substance of the body and blood of Christ. The bread is no longer bread but has become the body of Christ; and the wine is no longer wine but has become the blood of Christ. The bread has the appearance of bread — looks, tastes, and smells like bread, but it is no longer bread; the wine looks, tastes, and smells like wine, but it is no longer wine. This is called the doctrine of *transsubstantiation*, the change of one thing or substance into another thing or substance.

a. Transsubstantiation.

4. What became of the bread and wine when Jesus pronounced these words over them: "This is My Body"—"This is My Blood?"

The bread was changed into the Body, and the wine into the Blood of Jesus Christ.

5. After these words of Christ, what still remained of the bread and wine?

Nothing remained of bread and wine, but their species or appearances.

6. What is meant by the *appearances* of bread and wine?

By appearances of bread and wine, is meant all that our senses perceive of bread and wine, such as form, color, taste, etc.

The point here is not, whether Christ *could* change the bread and wine into His body and blood, if He so desired. The point is simply this: Is there any Scriptural proof that He does effect this change?

Rome, of course, appeals to the Words of Institution: "Take, eat; this is my body." . . . "Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament". Matt. 26, 26-28. Here the Lord declares expressly that what He gives His disciples is His body and blood. Therefore, says Rome, there can be no bread nor wine present, but only the body and blood of Christ. What our senses perceive to be bread and wine is not bread and wine, but only the appearances of bread and wine.

These words, however, do not of *necessity* need to be understood in that sense. Jesus could easily say, This is My body, this is My blood, without implying that the bread and wine *became* His body and blood. We have a very similar case in the declaration that "the

Word was made flesh." John 1, 14. By "Word" we are here to understand the Son of God, the second person of the Holy Trinity. But when the Son of God became man, *it is not implied* that the substance of the second person of the Trinity passed over into the substance of flesh, that is, human nature; for then He would have ceased to be the divine Son of God, just as bread and wine, according to the Romish view, cease to be bread and wine. That "the Word was made flesh" means that the second person of the Trinity assumed human nature, or as Paul says (Phil. 2, 7), "took upon him the form of a servant," without ceasing to be the divine Son of God.

We said above that probably this is what Jesus meant. Other words of Scripture show that this *is* just what He meant. We may rest assured that the apostle St. Paul knew whether the bread and wine remained bread and wine after the consecration or not. But Paul repeatedly calls the elements bread and wine after the consecration. In I Cor. 11, 26, Paul says, "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do shew the Lord's death till He come." In verses 27 and 28, in speaking of the consecrated bread, he again uses the term "bread" twice. In I Cor. 10, 16, he says, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" Here he again speaks of the consecrated elements, of their state when, according to the Catholic view, the change has taken place, and declares that the two are together, have communion, the wine and the blood, and the bread and the body; consequently the bread and the wine are bread and wine after the consecration just as before.

Taking al the above facts together we get this:

First, the bread and wine remain real bread and wine after the act of consecration just as they were before.

Secondly, Christ's true and real body and blood are present in, with and under the bread and wine; but just how the body and blood are present in the earthly elements no man knows, and therefore, too, we do not try to explain just how they are present.

b. The power of the priest to change the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ.

8. Did Christ give His Apostles the power to change bread and wine into His Sacred Body and Blood?

Yes; He gave them this power by these words: "Do this for a commemoration of Me." — St. Luke xxii. 19.

9. To whom did this power pass from the Apostles?

It passed from the Apostles to their successors, the rightly ordained Bishops and Priests of the Church.

Here a second grievous error of Rome on the Eucharist is exposed. She seeks her proof for this power of the priest in the words, "This do in remembrance of me." Perry in his "Instructions" says in this connection that "by these words He gave *power and commission* to His apostles and their successors *to do what He had done* — namely, to change bread and wine into His body and blood, and to administer the same to others".

Rome's argument here is this: Christ changed the bread and wine into His body and blood; He then told His disciples to do just as He had done; consequently His disciples and their successors were empowerd to

change the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ.

The reasoning seems very plausible, but it needs looking into. It has already been shown that the change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ does not take place at all. Yet that alone does not dispose of the question here, for something does take place and the act of consecration does mean something. At some time during the act of communion the body and blood of Christ and the bread and wine are brought into communion with each other, but just at what point of time no one is able to say. That is the Lord's part and we do not need to know. Furthermore, this communion into which the bread and wine, on the one side, and the body and blood, on the other side, enter is not the result of any power, which the priest or minister possesses or exercises, but solely the result of the power of Christ's original words of institution. What the priest has to do is only to say again what Christ said at the first, that is, to repeat in the proper way and as the minister of Christ in His Church, the Words of Institution. No word of God ever loses its force, at least not so long as God does not Himself will it. At the beginning God said unto man, "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth." Gen. 1, 28. That word is still in force and is just as powerful today as when it was first spoken and will continue so until the end of time. So also in the case of the Eucharist, wherever these words are used as Christ intended they should be used and with the view of celebrating the holy Sacrament, there the same things will take place that took place at the first institution; not, however, by virtue

of any power possessed by the priest or minister, but solely by the power of Christ's words.

The notion that the priest has power to change the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ is, of course, in keeping with Rome's idea of the priesthood, namely, that certain powers and authority have been given the priest by the Lord, that have not been given to the ordinary believer, and that he therefore belongs to an order or class by himself.

c. The Adoration of the Host.

The third error of Rome concerning the Eucharist — a most grievous error — is the notion that the bread and wine which have been changed into the body and blood of Christ by the priest always remain the body and blood of Christ so long as any particle of them is left.

11. Do the bread and wine remain on the altar after the consecration?

No; after the consecration there is on the altar neither bread nor wine, but the true Body and the true Blood of Jesus Christ under the appearances of bread and wine.

12. How long does Jesus Christ remain present with His sacred Body and Blood?

Jesus Christ remains as long as the species or appearances of bread and wine continue to exist.

14. When the priest breaks or divides the sacred Host, does he also break the Body of Christ?

No; he breaks or divides the species only; the entire and living Body of Jesus Christ is present in each part.

Here then the monstrous doctrine is taught that the bread and the wine which have been changed into the body and blood of Christ always remain the body and blood of Christ; and no matter into how many small

pieces the wafer or host may be divided, each little part is the whole body of Christ; and every little drop of wine or what appears to be wine is all the blood of Christ. To be more exact, this is the way: every particle into which the wafer may be divided is the whole person of Christ, body and blood; and every little drop that may be taken from the cup is the entire person of Christ, body and blood.

Furthermore, these species of bread and wine may be kept for days and months and years, and may be carried from place to place, yet they are never again mere bread and wine, but are always the real body and blood of Christ, that is, the real person of Jesus Christ.

This delusion about the consecrated bread and wine has led Rome into the idolatrous practice of worshiping the host, that is, paying divine honors to the consecrated wafer.

16. What does the Real Presence of our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament require of us?

The Real Presence of our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament requires of us to visit Him often, and to adore Him with the deepest humility and the warmest love.

The Feast of Corpus Christi commemorates the Real Presence.

In this Feast of Corpus Christi the priest carries Christ, in the form of a little wafer, about in a holy vessel. The people follow in solemn procession and do obeisence to the little wafer. Wherever they come into the presence of such a wafer, whether in the church or elsewhere, they are required to bow before it, for it is the real and true Christ. For some such wafers it is

claimed that they have performed miracles of healing, and they are kept as holy shrines and people make pilgrimages to them to pray before them and receive bodily and spiritual blessings. There is one such wafer at St. Christiana, France,* upon which it is averred that drops of blood have appeared; thus the priests delude the people into believing that the wafer is always the real body of Christ.

We rid ourselves of all this foolishness and of all this superstition and idolatry by holding fast to the simple facts of the Words of Institution; namely, that when the guest receives the consecrated bread and wine he therewith receives also the body and blood of Christ—but just how we do not know; and furthermore, that after the communion the bread is mere bread and the wine mere wine just as they were before. The sacrament continues only as long as the communion itself continues, that is, as long as any guests are receiving the sacrament. When there are no more guests the sacrament is over; and the bread is bread and the wine is wine. Or rather, the bread is bread and the wine is wine throughout the sacrament. Any wafers or any wine that may be left should be properly disposed of, but only as bread and wine, yet as bread and wine that had been used for a holy purpose. We certainly should, as is said above, often visit our Lord and adore Him with all humility and the warmest love, but never as in a consecrated wafer or drop of wine.

---

* Immediately after the consecration of the elements by the priest at St. Christiana, France, the Host streamed blood. At another time a Host into which a Jew had driven a knife shed blood. This is vouched for as late as 1880 by the Chamberlain of Pope Leo XIII.

d. Communion in one kind.

39. Have we to drink of the chalice, to receive the blood of Christ?

No; for under the appearance of bread we receive also the Blood of Christ, since we receive His living body.

"Whosoever shall eat this bread or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthly, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord."— 1 Cor. xi. 27.

As is well known in the Romish church the people receive only the bread in the sacrament, not the wine. Only the priest takes both bread and the wine. Rome justifies this in part on the ground that, since in the living body of Christ His blood is always present in His body, therefore when the guest receives the wafer which is the whole body and person of Christ he of necessity recives the blood with the bread, that is, with the body.

This looks reasonable; it satisfies reason; but reason has nothing to say here. It is not for us to say how these things should be, but for Christ alone. He, however, said expressly to the disciples, "Drink ye *all* of it." Why should any one want to change that and say that it is sufficient if the priest drinks all of it?

Furthermore, the apostle Paul certainly knew what Jesus' mind was in this matter, for he tells us expressly that he received instructions concerning the sacrament directly from Jesus: "For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed took bread," etc. I Cor. II, 23. But in this same connection Paul says, "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come." Verse 26. These words of the apostle certainly mean that all in the congregation at Corinth, the priests or elders and the

people, partook of both the bread and the cup. In the three verses following, the same fact is stated four times: "Wherefore, whosoever shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord, in an unworthy manner, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of the bread, and drink of the cup. For he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself, if he discern not the Lord's body."

Rome tries to prove her position in part by the little word "or" in the above proof passage, "eat this bread *or* drink this chalice;" as though the apostle meant to say that it was not necessary for a person to receive both the bread and the wine, but that he could receive the entire sacrament by taking either only the bread or only the wine. But the words of Paul neither say nor imply any such thing. We need to recall here just how the sacrament was observed at Corinth. The bread was partaken of first; later, some time intervening, the wine; in other words, the bread was taken during the meal and the wine after the meal. The two were not taken together nor in quick succession. It was possible, therefore, for one to receive the one element in a worthy manner, but not the other. There is, therefore, here no thought at all that it was sufficient to receive the one or the other.

There can be no doubt, the custom then was — and it was the will of the Lord — that the people as well as the priests or elders received the sacrament in both kinds.

As a matter of fact, too, the systematic withholding of the cup from the laity did not begin until the twelfth century, and then not without great opposition on the part of some teachers.

One naturally asks yet what Rome's object is in withholding the cup from the laity. To this we have the following reply added in the form of a note to the above question:

To preserve the sacred Blood from being profaned, and to make it easy for all to receive the Blessed Sacrament, the Church gives Holy Communion to the faithful in one kind only — namely, under the appearance of bread.

One must admire the thoughtfulness and the conscientious care of these people to improve upon the methods of Jesus Christ, to make things more safe and sacred, and also more convenient. Jesus, of course, was under no necessity of being so painfully fearful lest a drop of the cup be spilled, for He did not teach that a drop from the cup that might accidentally be spilled was His blood, much less, His entire person.

By way of a note we may be permitted to add here yet that a certain ex-priest who had become a Protestant used this illustration. It bears upon the Romish view that the wine has only the appearance of wine but is not wine. Suppose a priest who is about to drink the cup would be told that someone had put poison in the cup, would he drink it? Certainly not. But how can there be poison in the wine if there is no wine there, only the appearance of wine? Or are we to suppose that the blessed blood of Christ can be poisoned? It is strange that the priest should be afraid of that cup.

e. The Sacrifice of the Mass.

21. What is the sacrifice of the New Law?

The Sacrific of the New Law is Jesus Christ Himself, who by His death on the cross offered Himself to His Heavenly Father for us.

22. Was all sacrifice to cease with the death of Christ?

No; in the New Law of Grace there was to be a perpetual Sacrifice, prefigured by the sacrifice of Melchisedeck, and foretold by the Prophet Malachias.

Holy Scripture declares (concerning Christ): "Thou art a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedeck." — Heb. vii. 17.

"From the rising of the sun even to the going down, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean oblation." — Mal. i. 11.

23. What is the Perpetual Sacrifice?

The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

24. Who instituted the Sacrifice of the Mass?

Jesus Christ instituted the Sacrifice of the Mass at the Last Supper.

25. What is the Mass?

The Mass is the Perpetual Sacrifice of the New Law, in which Christ offers Himself in an unbloody manner, as He once offered Himself in a bloody manner on the Cross.

26. Is the Sacrifice of the Mass the same as the Sacrifice of the Cross?

Yes; it is essentially the same Sacrifice; because in both, the same Victim, Jesus Christ, is offered.

27. Is there no difference between the Sacrifice of the Mass and the Sacrifice of the Cross?

Yes, there is a difference in the manner of offering.

28. In what manner did Christ offer Himself on the Cross?

On the Cross, Christ offered Himself in a bloody manner, dying a most painful death.

29. In what manner does Christ offer Himself in the Mass?

In the Mass, Christ offers Himself in an unbloody manner, without suffering or dying, under the appearances of bread and wine, by the hands of the priest His **representative.**

Here now we have again a monstrous teaching of the Romish church; and we have purposely quoted at length from her catechism so that the reader may see from her own words just what she says and teaches.

Properly speaking there are two kinds of sacrifices. First, sacrifices of atonement for sin; secondly, sacrifices of praise, thanksgiving, and service to God.

In the old Testament there were a number of sacrifices of the first kind. We point here only to the offering made on the great day of atonement, fully described in Lev. 16. As a matter of fact, however, those Old Testament sacrifices did not atone for sin in reality; but they did point forward to the only sacrifice that does atone for sin, namely, the sacrifice of Jesus Christ upon the cross. Jesus Christ then is the only atoning sacrifice spoken of in the New Testament; indeed, the only sacrifice of all time and of all places that really atones for sin. So much ought to be plain without further words or proof passages.

But it should be just as clear that Jesus Christ offered himself only once and that sacrifice is never to be repeated. In Heb. 9, 27-28, we read:

"And inasmuch as it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this cometh the judgment; so Christ also, having been once offered to bear the sins of many, shall appear a second time, apart from sin, to them that wait for him, unto salvation." The sense of the passage is that as man dies once and then must stand before the judgment seat of Christ, for Christ is to be the judge; so Christ died once for the sins of men and now will come again the second time to judge men, receiving unto salvation those who believe, but condemning those who do not believe. There is therefore only one sacrifice and

by that one sacrifice men will be either saved or lost, according as they receive or reject that one atonement for sin.

Again we read:

"And every priest indeed standeth day by day ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, the which can never take away sins; but he, when he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God; henceforth expecting till his enemies be made the footstool of his feet. For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.." Heb. 10, 11-14.

Here we are told how the priests in the Old Testament offered sacrifices, the same sacrifices, day after day and year after year, and yet they never took away a single sin; it was all a shadow pointing forward to Christ. This exemplifies strikingly what the Romish priests still do; they are endlessly repeating the sacrifice of the Mass, but they do not atone for a single sin. All that might possibly be said is that the Mass points back to the offering made upon the cross. But there is no command for such a ceremony; on the contrary, Christ has given us the sacrament of the Lord's Supper as the means whereby to remember His death for us. On the other hand, Christ is here declared to have given himself as an offering for sin, once and for all time to come; and that now, without any further offering, all His enemies will be made His footstool and all who accept Him will be forever sanctified. There is absolutely no room here for any other offering for sin, of any kind whatsoever.

However, the above does not suffice to clear up everything. Rome claims that the Mass is an unbloody

sacrifice of Christ. He sacrificed himself once upon the cross in a bloody manner, that is, shed His blood; but now He wants that sacrifice repeated in an unbloody manner; that is, that the whole person of Christ be offered again and again, just as He was offered upon the cross, only that no blood be shed.*

In the first place, there is no atoning sacrifice without the shedding of blood. An atoning sacrifice always means the surrender of life, the shedding of blood. The wages of sin is death; that is, by his sin man forfeited his life; and now life must be given to redeem it, buy it back. That life Christ gave when He died upon the cross; that was the shedding of blood that takes away sin. Whatever other sacrifices with reference to Christ

---

* The Mass is called the UNBLOODY Sacrifice, but the term UNBLOODY is not anywhere defined. The Protestant is met with the statement for argument's sake. If the monstrousness of the Mass is referred to then the Protestant is told that it is an unbloody sacrifice implying that there is no suffering, while as a matter of fact Romanists are led to believe that there is real suffering endured. The following words of Cardinal Gibbons makes this clear:

"Whenever therefore we assist at Mass let us represent to ourselves the Mass as another Calvary, which it is in REALITY.

"Should not our hearts, though cold and hard as rocks, be softened at the spectacle of our God suffering for love of us and in expiation for our sins?

"If the wounds of the Martyrs plead so eloquently for us, how much more eloquent is the BLOOD OF CHRIST SHED DAILY UPON OUR ALTARS?"

The faithful believe that the blood of Christ is shed daily upon the altar and that the full measure of redeeming pain is daily endured by our Blessed Redeemer.

Only for sake of argument with Protestants is the term "Unbloody" used in symbolical books.

may be offered, they cannot take away sin, for there can be no further shedding of Christ's blood; and "apart from shedding of blood there is no remission. Heb. 9, 22.

In the second place, there is nowhere a single word of command that the offering made upon the cross should be repeated in this way nor in any other way. Jesus indeed said when He instituted the Lord's Supper, "Do this in remembrance of me." But what was done in that first sacrament? Did the disciples offer something to Christ or to God? Nothing of the kind. On the contrary, Christ offered himself, His body and His blood, to them. And just that and nothing else is done today also wherever the Lord's Supper is properly celebrated; we offer nothing to God, but Christ gives himself to us. In connection with the sacrament we, of course, offer God our praise and thanksgiving for His goodness and mercy, but there is no offering made by us that looks toward the atonement for sin. And even the body and blood of Christ which He gives us in the sacrament are not given as a further atonement for sin, but as a sacramental means for conveying to us the benefit of the one offering made upon the cross and that we may always remember His death for us.

But what about the proof passages used above, do they not prove that Christ is to be a perpetual priest? Yes, Christ shall forever be a priest, "forever after the order of Melchizedeck." But, in the first place, this speaks of Christ, what He is, not what a Romish priest is nor of what he is to do. In the second place, the words do not mean that Christ will forever be offering himself as a sacrifice; He did that once for all, as we have seen. Yet Christ will be a priest forever, for a

priest has other duties besides offering sacrifices. One such duty is that of intercession and of Christ it is said that "he ever liveth to make intercession for them. Heb. 7, 25.

The other passage from Malachi proves nothing either. We said above that aside from sacrifices of atonement there are sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving. These are the sacrifices to which the prophet refers. These are oft referred to in the Bible:

"Through him then let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of lips which make confession to his name. But to do good and to communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." Heb. 13, 15-16.

"I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your spiritual service." Rom. 12, 1.

"The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise." Ps. 51, 17.

Such are the sacrifices which we have to offer and such only; and of such sacrifices the Bible speaks oft. But let the above suffice.

But what is the purpose of the Mass? Here is Rome's answer:

35. What are the ends for which we offer the Mass to God?

We offer the Mass to God—

1. As a Sacrifice of Praise, for His honor and glory;

2. As a Sacrifice of Thanksgiving, for all the graces and benefits received from Him;

3. As a Sacrifice of Propitiation, to obtain pardon for our sins, and to avert the punishment we deserve;

4. As a Sacrifice of Petition, to implore aid in all our needs of soul and body.

As to sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving, we have seen above what they are, namely, that we thank and praise God with our lips and our hearts, that we serve Him with our body and soul and all that we have, and especially that we serve Him by doing good to one another.

As to a sacrifice of petition, there is not a word anywhere in the New Testament showing that the Lord's Supper is to be looked upon as a form of prayer. That we should pray in connection with the celebration of the Holy Communion is evident, but the sacrament itself is something that God gives us, not something that we offer to Him.

As to propitiation, we have seen that the celebration of the Lord's Supper cannot make any atonement for sin. In the sacrament we get the benefit of Christ's atonement made for us on the cross, but there is no atonement made by the sacrament itself, no matter how often it is repeated. Yet that is just what Rome teaches, that saying the Mass, this supposed offering of Christ in an unbloody manner, propritiates for sin.

36. To whom are the fruits of the Mass applied? we are told:

The fruits of the Mass are applied in general to the whole Church, both the living and the dead.

Rome teaches that the Mass benefits anyone for whom it is said, even if he is not present; and the benefit is chiefly that it propitiates for his sins, gets some sort

of forgiveness for them. This is true also of the dead, that is, those who are in Purgatory; having Mass said for the dead gets them out of Purgatory the sooner. In answer to the question:

How do the souls in Purgatory share in our spiritual goods? we have the answer:

They are assisted by our prayers,* alms-deeds, the application of indulgences, by other good works, but especially by the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

Thus we see that by providing money to have Mass said — for it will not be said without money — the living can help the dead out of Purgatory.

If, in conclusion, it be asked why Rome has invented the Mass and all that is connected with it our answer is that it is in keeping with the entire Romish system: on the one hand, to have something which men can do, something by which they can in some way earn or merit their salvation; on the other hand, to confer power upon the priest: here he has power to offer Christ in an un-

---

* The souls in Purgatory are freed by Prayers, Fastings, and Penances. By prayers are not meant what a Protestant understands by that term. I say a Rosary or a Pater Noster and because I do that deed God is bound to take so many days from the stay in Purgatory of any person whom I may name. The mere doing of the thing, that is, the mere saying of the Rosary or of the Pater Noster is for the Roman Catholic prayer and merits something. In reality it is a mere lip service and spiritually is worth nothing. By Fastings: If I abstain from meat three times each week, God is bound to pay me by shortening the stay of my friend in purgatory for whom I intend to fast. By Penances: If I wear a hair shirt or peas in my boots, God is bound to give me my desires because I have mortified myself for the purpose of obtaining my desires from God.

bloody manner; he can do this for himself and he can do it for others, present or absent; he can do it even for the dead; but in all cases he must be paid; and woe to him who has incurred the priest's displeasure and for whom he will no longer say Mass; the everlasting curse is upon him.

SACRAMENTALS.

1. What do you mean by Sacramentals

By Sacramentals I mean:

1. All the things blessed or consecrated by the Church for the Divine service, or for our own pious use, as Holy Water, Oil, Salt, Palms, Candles, etc.;

2. Also the Exorcisms, Blessings, and Consecrations used by the Church.

2. Why are such things called Sacramentals?

They are called Sacramentals because they resemble the Sacraments, though essentially different from them.

3. What is the difference between Sacramentals and the Sacraments?

1. The Sacraments were instituted by Christ Himself; the Sacramentals by the Church, which has received the power from Christ to do so;

2. The Sacraments effect interior holiness by the power which God gave them; the Sacramentals benefit soul and body by the prayers and blessings of the Church.

4. Why should we make a devout use of Sacramentals?

Because through the Sacramentals we have a part in the prayers and blessings of the entire Church, in whose name the Priest consecrates and blesses them.

We shall not use much space on the "Sacramentals." though, for reasons that shall appear, a few things need to be said.

Sacramentals, as the word implies, are a kind of sacrament. They do not possess the virtue of a sacrament, yet are supposed to confer spiritual blessings and

therefore they are made much of by the church of Rome. In question 3 above the distinction is made between Sacraments and Sacramentals, that the former "effect interior holiness," while the latter "benefit soul and body." If the Sacramentals benefit the soul, then they also effect an interior benefit, for one cannot speak of an exterior benefit or holiness of the soul. It appears therefore that after all the Sacramentals, in this respect at least, are very much like the Sacraments themselves.

Furthermore, they are said to benefit the body. There must therefore be some virtue in these Sacramentals, some healing property as in medicine. Rome cannot have in mind the natural virtues, for example, as of water and oil; for these elements possess those natural virtues whether blessed or consecrated by the priest or not. But if the consecrated water and oil possess certain virtues which they did not possess before, then these must have been imparted by the priest's blessing. So much should be plain to anyone.

But where is the word of God which by some form of command either directs the priest to bless these elements for the purposes intended or confers upon him the power to impart to water and oil certain additional virtues? Outside the water in holy Baptism and the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper there is no command that any such natural element should be consecrated and set apart for some special holy use. For that reason, too, the catechism gives no proof passage for the Sacramentals. Rome gets her proof for her Sacramentals, as for many other things, outside the Bible, namely in tradition. For us, however, tradition carries no authority.

The fact is that these Sacramentals have been derived in part from Judaism, where water in particular was used in many religious ceremonies, and in part from Paganism which, as every one knows, is loaded with all sorts of superstitious practices and usages.

If these Sacramentals were used simply as outward ceremonies and emblems of truths and historic facts, then there could be no objection, provided the thing were not overdone. In the Lutheran church the lighted candle is used in many churches; not, however, as possessing any virtue nor as conferring in any sacramental way a blessing, but simply as an outward emblem of the inner light of God's word. Nor is it required of any Lutheran congregation to use the candles or any other such emblem. A Romish church, on the other hand, would not be complete without the vessel of Holy Water, the Candles and numerous other insignia; the regular worship of a Romish congregation could not be conducted without these things. Hence they become what may almost be called essentials in their worship. Here then we again ask, where is there a word of God for such a worship?

These things easily lead to most serious abuses. For one thing the common class of people in the Romish church who do not read their Bibles — and remember, a Roman Catholic is not expected to read the Bible* — are easily led to think that these Sacramentals really possess healing and sanctifying powers. They may, and doubtless often *do*, imagine that the Holy Water with which they touch themselves as they enter the church or with

* Many if not all Romish Bibles in the preface declare the evil of Bible reading. Let the reader look the matter up.

which they are sprinkled on certain occasions as they sit in their pews really confers some spiritual or bodily blessing, that in some way it really makes them better in the sight of God. It is a shame and a crime for a priest so to delude his ignorant people.

But the abuse goes much farther. This Holy Water is good even for animals. We quote here from the *Lutheran Standard* of April 1, 1916, page 210, which in turn is quoted from Herzog Real Encyc., a work recognized as an authority in all Christian countries. "On January 17, St. Anthony's day, and at the monastery of that name located in Rome, horses and other animals are blessed with consecrated water. A pater [priest] is seated at a table within the church raking in the dues whilst another attends to the sprinkling. Also the papal cavalry appears there in its troops in order to receive the benediction for its horses. Several owners of horses with whom I spoke in the year 1841, assured me that by this (ceremony) their animals were protected against accidents of all kinds, and sought to support their faith in the efficacy of these benedictions by the narration of many wonderful deliverances in great dangers."

Whether that "pater" who raked in the coins really knew that the whole thing was a fake may be questioned, he may himself have believed in such a veterinary use of the water; but that his chief interest was in the coins can hardly be doubted.

We add another quotation from "Popery" by Joseph S. Van Dyke, page 76, where the author says that "the following may be found over the vessels of holy water in the Church of S. Carlo Borromeo, in the Corso, at Rome:

"Holy water possesses much usefulness when Christians sprinkle themselves with it with due reverence and devotion. The Holy Church proposes it as a remedy and assistant in many circumstances both spiritual and corporeal, but especially in these following:

"Its Spiritual Usefulness.

"1. It drives away devils from places and persons.

"2. It affords great assistance against fears and diabolical illusions.

"3. It cancels venial sins.

"4. It imparts strength to resist temptations and occasions to sin.

"5. It drives away wicked thoughts.

"6. It preserves safely from the passing snares of the devil, both internally and externally.

"7. It obtains the favor and presence of the Holy Ghost, by which the soul is consoled, rejoiced, and excited to devotion and disposed to prayer.

"8. It prepares the mind for a better attendance on the divine mysteries, and receiving piously and worthily the most Holy Sacrament.

"Its Corporeal Uses.

"1. It is a remedy against barrenness in women and beasts.

"2. It is a preservation from sickness.

"3. It heals the infirmities both of the mind and of the body.

"4. It purifies infected air and drives away plague and contagion."

The above author adds: *"Wonderful Water!"*

FAITH.

In the Protestant church, especially in the Lutheran branch, very much is made of faith. A study of the great Reformation of the sixteenth century, when the Protestant church originated by breaking away from Rome, shows two things which above all others were proclaimed and made prominent: the one that the holy Scriptures alone, without tradition and the teachings of church councils and popes, are the only rule of faith and life; the other that a man is justified and saved alone through faith.

If this be true, that faith is so important and that a man is saved through faith, then it is only natural that in our teaching and preaching much stress must be laid upon faith, both upon the necessity of faith and then also that faith be of the right kind.

Just this, however, is what we do not find in the Roman Catholic church. In her catechism scarcely two pages are given to the consideration of faith, while about ten pages are given to the Sacrament of Penance. Faith is written on almost every page of the Bible, yet in Rome's catechism very little more space is given to faith than to Indulgence, for which there is not a single warrant in the Scriptures. The same is true of the Mass, which is contrary to all teaching of Christ and the apostles, yet more attention is given to the Mass than to faith of which Christ and the apostles speak constantly.

These things are significant. They lead one to expect that the way of salvation in the Romish church is

really not through faith alone but chiefly through her many sacraments and the works connected therewith. Her definition of faith does not suffice unto salvation, and hence the other things are added as necessary.

1. What do you mean when you say "I believe?"

When I say "I believe," I mean that I take as true what another says, precisely because he says it.

2. What, then, is it "to believe in God?"

To believe in God is, with His Grace, to take as true all that He has said or revealed, precisely because He has said or revealed it.

Notice carefully, in the first place, what faith is here declared to be: *to take as true what another says, precisely because he says it.* This is true only in case God is the speaker. When God speaks we are to believe or take as true whatever He says simply because He says it. God being God, cannot lie, cannot deceive us, cannot be mistaken; therefore we must accept His word without question. And we must accept that word not only when it commends itself to our own mind and when we can understand it, but also when we cannot understand it, or when it seems altogether contrary to our way of thinking. When God says that He divided the waters of the Red Sea for Israel to pass over on dry ground, we are to believe it, though we cannot understand how He could do so. Or when God's word says that there is but one God, that there are, however, three persons in the Godhead, namely, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, we are to believe the statement, though it is altogether contrary to our reason and way of thinking.

When, however, we are speaking of any other person than God or of any institution, then the above defi-

nition of faith is not correct. Where is the man whose word we would accept as true *simply because he says it?* We ourselves have not yet met such a man; nor has any other person who has his wits fully about him. When men speak we must have other evidence of the truth of their words than simply or precisely because they say the thing. The word of one man may carry more authority on a given subject than the word of another man, but we accept no man's word simply because he says it; otherwise we might easily becomes the dupes of any rascal in human form. Paul did not stop with men, but took in the angels also: "But though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema." Gal. 1, 8.

Consider well, however, how this definition of faith fits into the Romish system. We saw in the chapters on "The Church" and on "The Pope" that in the Romish system the Church is the teacher; she is God's spokesman here upon earth. Also that she speaks infallibly, that whatever she says must be true as though God himself were speaking in person. In her catechism in connection with the subject of faith we have this:

4. Who teaches us infallibly what God has revealed?

The Catholic Church, which Christ has established, teaches us infallibly what God has revealed.

We shall not stop here to explain how neither the Catholic church nor any other church, that is, denomination, is infallible or can be infallible — that has been done sufficiently elsewhere; but that is Rome's notion and claim, that she is infallible, that whatever she says

is true and must be accepted, precisely because she says it.

This claim now, as must be clear to anyone, gives Rome complete power over her people in all matters of faith. She is the teacher; what she says the people must accept and dare ask no questions. For that reason too it is not necessary for a Catholic to read his Bible; in fact, we have seen already that Rome does not want her people to read the Bible: nothing more is needed than to listen to the priest, believe what he says and ask no questions. Thank God that we have been delivered from that tyranny!

The other thing to be said about Rome's definition of faith pertains more to the nature of faith itself. To believe means simply to *take as true* what is said. We say "simply," because the above is all that we can find on faith in Rome's catechism. Faith is nothing more than simpy to hold the thing said as true.

Applying this view of faith to the word of God, for it is the word of God that we are to believe without question, nothing more is required of us than to hold that word to be true in all its parts and teachings. When the Bible says that God created the heavens and the earth, we are to take that as true. When the Bible says that God feeds and clothes and keeps us day by day, we are to take that as true; nothing more. When the Bible says that Jesus Christ redeemed us from our sins, we are to take that as true; nothing more. So with every other doctrine of the Bible, great or small; we are simply to take them as true; nothing more.

The Protestant or Lutheran view of faith is altogether different. As a matter of course, we must hold God's word to be true. There faith makes its beginning.

We simply cannot believe a statement without holding it to be true. The two things include each other. If we believe a statment, we hold it to be true; if on the other hand we hold it to be true, we at least insofar believe it.

But the Protestant view of faith includes more, something much more important, namely, confidence or trust. To believe God's word means in the true and full sense to trust God's word, to put one's confidence in that word. In our own Lutheran catechism (Joint Synod of Ohio edition) we have this definition of faith: *"Faith is the confidence of the heart that we through Christ have forgiveness of sin and a gracious God."*

This definition of faith presupposes, of course, that the person accepts as true what he believes, otherwise he could not be said to believe it. Here, however, confidence, that is, trust in, or reliance upon, that which one believes is especially brought out as an element of faith. Simply to hold the promises of the Gospel to be true, but not to put one's trust in them, not to rely upon them for salvation, is no true and living faith; it is not the faith which the word of God says we must have in order to be saved. To accept Christ by faith means more than simply to believe that He is the Savior; it means to trust Him as one's Savior. A few Scripture passages will make these things plain:

"For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life." John 3, 16.

"And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved and thy house." Acts 16, 31.

In both these passages we are told expressly what we must do to be saved, namely, believe on Christ. But note well that it is not said simply to believe Christ, that

is, hold Him to be the Savior; but to believe *on* Him; and that must mean to put our reliance upon Him, to put our trust in Him as our Savior.

Furthermore, to believe *on* Christ is not simply to believe Christ, that is, to take what He says to be true, but to believe on *Him himself;* not simply to believe the word of Christ, but the *Person* of Christ. To believe on Christ means to accept Him as one's personal Savior; but that cannot be done without putting one's trust in Him. That is the faith of little children concerning whom Jesus says that we are to be like them. It is not some word of Christ that they believe; they may not be old enough yet to know such words or statements; but they trust Him as they trust their father or mother.

However, it is certainly not necessary to dwell upon this matter at great length, for it must be plain to everyone who has read his Bible carefully that saving faith means more than simply to hold God's word to be true.

JUSTIFICATION.

In the Reformation of the sixteenth century justification through faith was one of the two great doctrines for which the reformers contended, the other being the doctrine that the Holy Scriptures are the only rule of faith and life. Quite naturally, therefore, the Lutheran church today yet looks upon justification through faith as one of her most precious treasures.

The Romish church, on the other hand, has very little to say about justification. Indeed, in her catechism the doctrine does not appear at all by itself, but only in connection with "Sanctifying Grace." And even there justification is something altogether different from what we understand it to be. In reality, therefore, the Romish church does not have justification at all in its true evangelical sense.

9. What is Sanctifying Grace?

Sanctfying Grace is an unmeritted, supernatural gift, which the Holy Ghost communicates to our soul and which renders us just and holy before God.

11. Why is Sanctifying Grace called also the Grace of Justification?

Because by Sanctifying Grace we are justified — that is, we pass from the state of sin to the state of righteousness and holiness.

Notice here that in the teaching of Rome Justification and Sanctification are combined into one act, namely,

the act of making holy, or passing "from the state of sin to the state of righteousness and holiness."

This is contrary to the Scriptures; for although justification and sanctification are most closely connected, so closely indeed that one cannot be present without the other, yet they are spoken of as two different things.

Justification is something which God does with *reference* to a man; not *within* the man; it is that act by which God declares a man, who believes in Christ, free from the guilt of sin and as just in His sight, that is, as though he had no sin. It does not mean that he has no sin, that he has become holy; but that his sin is forgiven, that it is not counted against him, that he is looked upon as not having committed any sin and is therefore accepted of God as His child.

Such a person is also accounted righteous before God; not as though he had any righteousness of his own, for he has not; he never had any and does not have any now, for he is still sinful. But he is accounted righteous in Christ whom he has accepted as his Savior; for Christ having taken all our sins upon himself and having atoned for them, that is, having paid the penalty, His merit becomes our own through faith in Him, so that God looks upon us as though we ourselves had fulfilled all righteousness.

This is what Paul means when he says, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." Rom. 8, 1. Whoever through true faith accepts Christ is free from condemnation on account of his sins, for they have all been forgiven. But this does not mean that such a person has no sins any more, that

is, that he has become holy in his own person; he is still a sinner and will be as long as he lives in the flesh.

The matter of righteousness is brought out plainly in the following passage of Paul: "For what saith the scripture? And Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh, the reward is not reckoned as of grace, but as of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is reckoned for righteousness. Even as David also pronounceth blessing upon the man, unto whom God reckoneth righteousness apart from works, saying,

Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven,
And whose sins are covered.
Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not reckon sin. Rom. 4, 3-8.

Here Paul tells us very plainly that God "reckons" or imputes righteousness to the person who believes. God does not impute holiness to the person; nor does He here speak of *making* him holy; nor does He *make* him righteous, but because of his faith in Christ God looks upon him as righteous, even as though he had committed no sin whatever.

Because of this teaching of Holy Scripture we have the following definition of justification (Joint Synod of Ohio catechism, page 116): "Justification is that act of God, by which He, of pure grace, for the sake of the merits of Christ, pronounces a poor sinner, who truly believes in Christ, free from guilt and declares him just."

Sanctification, on the other hand, means to *make* holy. It is something which takes place *within* the person who believes, a change from a life of sin to a life of holiness. Complete sanctification means complete holi-

ness, complete freedom from all sin, not only from the guilt and condemnation of sin as in justification, but complete freedom from sin itself. Complete sanctification is, of course, a state to which no one attains in this life. Whoever believes in Christ is completely justified, for all his sins are forgiven; but no one, no matter how great his faith may be, is completely sanctified in this life. As long as a man is in this sinful flesh he is more or less sinful.

The following are some of the passages which refer to sanctification:

"Sanctify them in the truth: thy word is truth." John 17, 17.

"Even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word, that he might present the church to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." Eph. 5, 25-27.

"And such were some of you: but ye were washed, but were sanctified, but ye were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God." I Cor. 6, 11.

In all the above passages the matter of making holy stands out prominently. That is what we mean by the grace that sanctifies, or by sanctification when used in connection with justification. It is the work of the Holy Spirit by which He purges out more and more the sin that sticks in our hearts.

Sanctification is always a fruit of justification. If a man has had his sins forgiven by the mercy of God and for the sake of Christ, then he will want to live in the Spirit and be guided by the Spirit and so do the will of

God and make progress in a holy life. All that taken together is sanctification.

The most dangerous thing about the confusion of justification and sanctification as held by the Romish church is this, that a person can never be certain of salvation. Salvation is made to depend upon one's state of sanctification, that is, upon one's holiness. But how is a person ever to know when he is holy enough to be fit for heaven? As a matter of fact and as we have seen already no one ever becomes completely sanctified in this life; consequently no one, on the strength of his own holiness, could hope to enter heaven.

Rome sees this difficulty and has made provision for its removal. How? By means of Purgatory. Of course, there is no such place as a purgatory; the Bible knows nothing about such a place. But that little thing does not matter. Rome says there is a purgatory and, therefore, a purgatory there must be; and the people cannot help themselves, they must simply believe it and prepare for it. In purgatory then the Roman Catholic must through suffering complete his atonement for sin and his holiness which he failed to complete in this life. That is the Catholic's outlook, because he confuses justification with sanctification.

The Protestant, however, who believes in justification through faith alone can say with Paul, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." He has complete forgiveness of sins, is accepted as God's child in Christ Jesus, and at death is taken direct to heaven. There are no further sins to atone for, and as to sanctification God will in His own way — just how we do not need to know — complete that and make the person fit for heaven.

GOOD WORKS.

In the chapter on "Faith" we saw that faith, according to the Romish view, is nothing more than simply to take the word of God to be true. Such a faith requires no trust, no confidence in God's promised mercy, that He forgives sin for Christ's sake. Such a faith can, of course, not save from sin; simply to take it as true that Christ is the Savior cannot possibly save anyone. Even an ungodly man can believe in that sense. In that sense even the devils believe: "Thou believest that God is one; thou doest well: the devils also believe, and shudder." Ja. 2, 19. The devils believe that there is a God, but they shudder at the thought, because they dare not hope for mercy, but look only for judgment. So a man may hold all God's word to be true, but if he has no trust in God's mercy, it will only fill him with fear.

We also saw in the chapter on "Justification" that Rome has no justification at all in the true evangelical sense. In Rome, therefore, a man cannot be saved by justification through faith alone. A true Protestant believes that; he believes as Paul teaches that a man can be saved alone through faith. No, that is not quite it. What a true Protestant believes is that there *is absolutely no other way of being saved except by grace through faith alone.*

But if the faith that Rome teaches does not and cannot save and if she does not have justification at all in the true Biblical sense, then she must have some other

way of saving her people. What is that way? It is largely by works.

We do not mean to say here that Rome's faith is of no value at all. Besides, many of her people doubtless have a better and truer faith than the church asks of them; that is, they combine trust with their faith, though the church does not ask that. Neither do we mean to say that Rome does not teach the forgiveness of sins at all as an act of grace and for the sake of Christ. What we mean is that the faith which she teaches and the forgiveness by grace which she teaches are not enough to save a man, that he needs something else for complete forgiveness. That something else is works. Under "Sanctifying Grace" we have the following:

15. What fruits does the justified man produce by the help of grace?

He produces good, that is meritorious, works; for "every tree bringeth forth good fruit." — St. Matt. vii. 17.

If in this definition Rome had stopped with "good" work, there could be no quarrel, for that is what Jesus says in the passage quoted. But that too is all that Jesus said; to carry the idea of merit into the word "good" is making Jesus say something which He never thought of, here nor elsewhere. But Rome is not satisfied with Jesus' definition of good works; out of good works she must make "meritorious" works in order to get her complete forgiveness of sins. Faith and grace alone do not suffice; she must add the merit of her works.

16. Can we do no good when we are in the state of mortal sin?

When we are in mortal sin we can do good, but cannot merit heaven.

Notice here again that Rome speaks of meriting heaven by doing good, that is, doing good works. The true Protestant believes that heaven is altogether a free gift of grace, without the least merit on our part, no matter how much good we may do. We give all the glory to God for getting us into heaven and not the least bit to ourselves.

But there is something else that is interesting in the above answer. The claim is made that a man can do good while in "the state of mortal sin." What is mortal sin? Under "Sin in General" we have this:

4. When do we commit mortal* sin?

We commit mortal sin, when we knowingly and willingly transgress the Law of God in a serious matter.

10. In what does the malice of mortal sin consist?

In this, that mortal sin is —

1. A grievous offence against God our sovereign Lord;

2. The most shameful ingratitude towards our heavenly Father;

3. A base unfaithfulness towards our gracious Redeemer.

11. What the the consequences of mortal sin?

Mortal sin —

1. Separates us from God, by depriving us of His love and friendship;

2. It robs us of all merits, and of our right to heaven; and

3. It draws upon us the judgments of God, and at last eternal damnation.

---

* It has always seemed to me that Rome's division of sin into two classes, Venial and Mortal, is unscriptural. The Bible knows only sin, not grades of sin. It was a venial sin that brought death into the world.

What seems strange is this claim that a man in the state of mortal sin has grievously offended God and his Savior, is separated from God and His love and friendship, is exposed to the judgments of God, excluded from heaven and on the way to eternal damnation, yet he can do good works; they do not merit anything, but they are still to be considered good. Surely if mortal sin is what Rome above says it is, then a man in that sin must be a corrupt tree; but Jesus says that a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit. Here, however, Rome again ignores the word of Jesus and makes these works good: they do not merit anything, but they are good and therefore not useless.

17. Is, then, the good done in mortal sin useless?

No; the good done in mortal sin is very useful for obtaining from God's mercy the grace of conversion, and sometimes for turning aside temporal punishment.

As proof that good done in mortal sin is helpful in obtaining the grace of conversion, reference is made to Cornelius the Centurion (Acts 10) whose alms and prayers were acceptable unto God and to whom God sent Peter to declare unto him the Gospel. The trouble with this proof, however, is this that Cornelius was not an example of a man in mortal sin, not even according to Rome's own definition of mortal sin. For we commit mortal sin when we "knowingly and willingly transgress the law of God in a serious matter." According to this definition only persons who have a knowledge of the true God and of His law can commit mortal sins. Ordinarily we speak of mortal sins only in the case of persons who claim to be or have been Christians. Cornelius,

however, was a Gentile who was just finding God and was serving God as far as his knowledge went.

But if, according to Rome, good done while in mortal sin is already useful in obtaining the grace of conversion, much more must real good works be helpful in obtaining salvation itself.*

18. What do we merit by the good works* which we do in the state of grace?

By the good works which we do in the state of grace we merit —

1. An increase of sanctifying grace;
2. Eternal salvation.

We do not deny that in doing good works, that is, the works which God himself asks, there will result an increase of sanctifying grace. What we do deny is that our good works merit that increase of grace. It is simply this way: as we do God's will in all things, in other words, walk in His commandments, for that is the good work which He asks of us — as we do these things, we grow in the various graces or gifts of the Holy Spirit. But we cannot speak of merit here; it is that spiritual growth with which God blesses us, just as He blesses us in temporal things when we are diligent in business; yet we do not speak of meriting our daily bread.

As to meriting eternal salvation as stated above, that is worse yet. We shall do nothing more here, however,

* Works according to Rome are not what a Lutheran, for example, understands by that word. He understands almsgiving etc., as this is the definition given by our Savior in the judgment scene: I was a hungered and ye gave me meat, etc. But to the Romanist the term good works applies to Prayers, Fastings, and Penances chiefly.

than to quote a number of passages to show that we merit nothing and that salvation is a fre gift from beginning to end:

"Because by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for through the law cometh the knowledge of sin.' Rom. 3, 20.

"We reckon therefore that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law." Rom. 3, 28.

"Yet knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ, even we believed on Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by the works of the law: because by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." Gal. 2, 16.

"For by grace have ye been saved through faith: and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works, that no man should glory." Eph. 2, 8-9.

"Not by works done in righteousness, which we did ourselves, but according to his mercy he saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit, which he poured out upon us richly, through Jesus Christ our Savior; that, being justified by his grace, we might be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." Tit. 3, 5-7.

Let these passages suffice. Nowhere is there the least intimation that our salvation, either as to justification or complete salvation, is in part due to the merit of good works; on the contrary, works are evehywhere purposely and carefully excluded.

It need hardly be stated in this connection that when we rule works out as having no part in meriting salvation, we do not mean that it is immaterial whether we do good works or not. Good works are a part of the

Christian's life; he is doing good works every day, that is, every day he is seeking to do God's will in all things. Indeed, the right kind of a Christian does not wait to be told to do good works; he is doing them right along, just like a good tree bears good fruit right along and cannot help it.

Here we are led to say a word also as to what good works are. In the Lutheran catechism (Joint Synod of Ohio, page 111) we have this definition of good works:

"All that a Christian thinks, speaks, and does from faith according to God's command and to His honor and glory." That is, by good worke we mean all that the Christian does in life, when done according to the will of God. Paul sums it up nicely when he says, "Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." I Cor. 10, 31.

Doubtless Rome also includes all this under good works; but she adds other things, such as fasting, abstaining from certain meats, observing certain days, praying the Rosary, crossing oneself, and the like things; and we are not sure but that she attaches more importance to these other things than to the things which God's word requires.*

Furthermore, much depends upon the spirit in which good works are done. The Pharisees in Jesus' time did a lot of good works; they fasted, prayed, did alms, washed their hands before eating and many other things; but Jesus denounced them as hypocrits because they did not do these things from fear and love of God, but in an outward formal manner and to be seen of men.

---

* As a matter of fact Rome attaches vastly more importance to fasting, etc., than to truly good works.

We do not want to place Romanists in a class with these Pharisees; on the contrary, doubtless the common people in the Romish church are mostly sincere in what they do in those things. The fault is not so much with the people as with the priests who mislead them. Yet whenever it is thought that works in some way help to merit salvation, then the danger is near to reduce such works to an outward performance. Without question Rome has done that to a great extent, especially with her extra works as fasting, praying and the like. She says that in good works God considers especially a "good intention":

3. What is a good intention?

A good intention is the purpose to serve and honor God in all our works.

24. How may we briefly make a good intention?

We may say, "My Lord and my God, all for Thy honor," or "Jesus, for love of Thee."

25. When should we make a good intention?

We should make a good intention often during the day, and especially in the morning.

A little reflection must convince one that a good intention as God requires it is really a good state of the heart. But that is something which cannot be attained simply by repeating with the lips some pious phrase One is reminded here at once of Jesus' words:

"This people honoreth me with their lips;
But their heart is far from me.
But in vain do they worship me,
Teaching as their doctrine the precepts of men."
Matt. 15, 8-9.

Furthermore, to "make a good intention" at certain times during the day is again too formal and superficial. Besides, good intentions are really "not made" at all; they must be begotten in the heart by the grace of the Holy Spirit.

Before leaving the subject of "Good Works" we quote a few more questions from the catechism together with their answers. They will emphasize still more the importance Rome attaches to works as a means unto salvation. Under "The Commandments" we find the following:

1. Is it sufficient for eternal salvation to believe all that God has revealed?

No; to obtain salvation, it is not sufficient simply to believe; we must also keep the Commandments.

"If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.'—Matt. xix. 17.

The difficulty with the above question is that it really requires a double answer, a sort of "Yes" and "No." If one said, "Yes, it is enough to believe," that might be misunderstood. One could say that then a man can live any kind of a life, no matter how godless; if only he believes, he will still be saved. This would especially be the case if faith were nothing more than what Rome claims it to be, namely, only to take Gods word to be true. Such a faith a man could have and still live on in sin, but, of course, he could not be saved by such a faith.

To answer the above question we therefore say, Yes, faith is enough; to believe all of God's word, all His Gospel promises, that will save a man. But it must be the right kind of a faith; it must be a faith of the heart

by which the whole man has been changed and has become a new creature. It must be a faith that produces fruit, namely, good works; yet these works are in no sense a merit or cause of salvation. On the contrary, because the man is saved, that is, in a saved state, therefore he can do good wooks. The man is not saved because he does good works, but he does good works because he is saved.

But does not the above proof passage settle the matter. There Jesus says that a man must keep the commandments in order to enter into life. Any careful reader of the Bible knows what Jesus meant by those words. A man who thought that he could be saved by good works came to Jesus to find out just what he must do. Jesus knew he wanted to save himself by keeping the commandments; therefore, He said, Keep them; that is, keep them perfectly, and thou wilt be saved. Which is true. If a man keeps all the commandments perfectly he is saved already and needs no further savior. But Jesus knew very well that the man could not keep the commandments perfectly and that he could therefore not be saved in that way. Jesus also tried to lead the young man to see this but failed.

Romanists can use the above passage as proof for their doctrine, because their people do not read the Bible and will not discover the real meaning of the passage. To quote this passage in the above connection looks almost like a Romish trick.

2. What commandments must we keep?

We must keep the Commandments of God and the Commandments of the Church.

Here we see Rome's authority again., The commandments of God are not enough; something must be added to the Bible, so Rome has therefore invented other commandments, such as fasting, abstaining from meats, keeping certain holy days and the like.

3. Are we able to keep all the Commandments?

Yes; with the assistance of God's grace we are able to keep all the commandments.

"My grace is sufficient for thee."—2 Cor. xii. 9.

Of course, Rome herself knows that her people—the priest above all included—do not keep all the commandments, since they practically all have to go to Purgatory before they get to heaven; yet she holds the possibility of keeping all the commandments and doubtless claims to have people who have done or are doing so. We however know that:

"There is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not." Eccl. 7, 20. And that:

"If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." I John 1, 8.

As to the promise, "My grace is sufficient for thee," that was meant to sustain Paul in his trials, as the context plainly shows, and not a promise or assurance that even Paul could keep all the commandments.

PRAYER.

We shall not need to say very much on the subject of prayer. On prayer in general we find three pages in the catchism and two on the Lord's Prayer in particular. The treatment is simple, devotional and in general very satisfactory. We want to commend Romanists also for the importance which they attach to prayer and for their habits of prayer and devotion. We are, of course, not commending everything they do in their ways of praying, only that they believe in prayer and are not ashamed nor too indolent to practice it. This is one of the things in which Protestants could often learn from their Catholic neighbors.

However, there are a few things in connection with prayer in the Romish church that are manifestly unscriptural and need to be looked at briefly.

1. The Merit of Prayer.

Under the question, Why does God allow us to be tempted? we have in the answer among other things this: "To increase our merits."

Here the idea of merit that we have observed so often comes to the surface again. Rome is constantly holding up to her people that they must do something to merit God's mercy. Their system is in part salvation by works. Prayer is represented as one of these works of merit, as we have already seen especially under "Satisfaction" and "Indulgences." To say a certain number of prayers, *Pater Nosters*, or *Hail Marys*, or the *Rosary*

is a good work and will increase the person's merit and lessen one's time of suffering in Purgatory. In the "Appendix" to the catechism we have this under "Pious Ejaculations."

To be repeated often during the day. There is an indulgence attached to each of these short prayers.

Jesus, Mary, Joseph! I give my heart and soul to you.

Jesus, Mary, Joseph! assist me in life and in death.

Jesus, Mary, Joseph! may I expire in your sweet embrace.

(An indulgence of 100 days for each of these three aspirations.)

Other examples are also given, but this one suffices to show the idea of merit connected with prayer. It would seem too that if one hundred days exemption from the temporal punishment of sin can be gained by one such little prayer it would be an easy matter to pile up thousands of years of exemption against the demands of Purgatory.

The Bible, of course, knows nothing of merit in connection with prayer. If we pray in the right way God has promised to hear our prayers and give us the things we ask; not, however, as though we merited the things, but solely because of His mercy and for the sake of Christ. The prayer merits nothing.

2. Prayer for the Dead.

Under the question, "For whom must we pray?" we have in the answer, among other things, this:

We must pray for all mankind, friends and enemies, for the living and the dead.

No scriptural proof is given showing that we should or may pray for the dead. Under "The Communion of

Saints" and in connection with Purgatory we find one passage which, however, is taken from the Apocryphal writings. But these books are not inspired and the proof of this passage is therefore worth no more than the claims of the Roman Catholic church herself.

Nowhere in the Scripture is there any command nor any encouragement that we should pray for the dead. The Scriptures teach very plainly that man's opportunity to be saved is in this life. It is not necessary to quote passages here. Those then who are received in heaven do not need our prayer; while those who wake up in hell cannot be reached nor helped by anything that we can do. In either case the prayer would be useless and therefore it is not commanded. Besides, the dead, whether in heaven or in hell, are altogether in the hands of God; we have nothing to do with them at all, as we have with the people here upon earth, and therefore God would not accept our intercessions in their behalf.

3. Prayer to Saints.

It is commonly known that Romanists pray to the saints. The most common prayer among them next to the Lord's Prayer is the *Hail Mary*, "the prayer said in honor of the Mother of God, and called the Angelical Salutation."

38. How many parts has the *"Hail Mary"?*

The "Hail Mary" has two parts: a Prayer of Praise and a Prayer of Petition.

39. Of what is the *Prayer of Praise* composed?

1. Of the words of the Archangel Gabriel: "Hail (Mary) full of grace, the Lord is with Thee; blessed art Thou among women;" and

2. Of the words of St. Elizabeth: "And blessed is the fruit of Thy womb (Jesus). — St. Luke i. 42.

44. Of what words is the Prayer of Petition composed?

The Prayer of Petition is composed of the words added by the Church: "Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners now and at the hour of our death. Amen."

45. Why were these words added by the Church?

These words were added by the Church, to implore the intercession of the Blessed Virgin in all our necessities, and to obtain through her the special grace of a happy death.

Note well how Rome worked this thing. The first part of the *Hail Mary* is taken from the Scriptures. But it is no petition at all. It is the angel's blessing upon Mary for what the Lord had done and would do for her. And certainly every true Christian will always honor the blessed Virgin, since God in His love and mercy chose her to be the mother of our Savior. But Rome does not stop with this; she adds her own words to the angel's saying and makes a prayer of it.

The catechism furnishes no proof that we may pray to the Virgin, nor that she could hear or help us if we did pray. Of course, there is no proof outside of Rome's own claim. On the contrary, Jesus has given us to understand, and that very plainly, that His mother is not to receive divine honors any more than any other saint. At the marriage at Cana He addressed her as "woman," not as mother, and said, "What have I to do with thee?" If Mary could not command her Son here upon earth neither can she command Him in heaven, that He should listen to her intercession in our behalf. So also upon the cross he addressed her as "woman," not as mother, showing that she was but one among other pious women.

We here quote from the catechism a prayer directed to the Virgin:

O Mary, my Queen and my Mother, I offer myself entirely to Thee, and in order to prove myself devoted to Thee, I consecrate to Thee this day my sight, my hearing, my speech, my heart, my whole being.

Since, therefore, I am Thine, O good Mother, preserve and defend me as Thy property and possession.

One could not surrender himself more fully to the Lord Himself than a Catholic in this prayer does to the Virgin Mary.

Romanists also pray to other saints. A form of prayer to the guardian angel and the patron saint is given. The part referring to the saint reads as follows:

Thou also, O happy saint whose name I bear, pray for me, that I may serve God faithfully in this life, as Thou hast done, and glorify Him eternally with Theen in heaven. Amen.

Here is an ejaculation to St. Joseph:

St. Joseph, friend of the Sacred Heart, pray for us.

Luther upon one occasion when he was terribly shocked by a thunder bolt cried out in his fear, "Help, Anna, beloved Saint! I will be a monk." That, of course, occurred before he had found the light.

4. Prayer to Angels.

If one may pray to the saints then certainly it is in order to pray to the angels. The "Angel Guardian" is especially often called upon for help:

O blessed spirit whom God in His mercy has appointed to watch over me, intercede for me this day, that I may not stray from the path of virtue.

No Scriptural proof is given for praying to the angels. Perry in his larger work gives a number of passages, but they are not applicable. He refers to the case of Abraham (Gen xix, 18-22) and to Lot and Jacob. But in all these cases the person spoken of as an angel was not an ordinary angel, but the Lord himself. A careful study of those accounts must convince any one who is unperjudiced of that fact.

On the other hand, we have an explicit statement which shows that we are not to worship the angels. St. John in his vision of heaven was about to do so, but was promptly forbidden:

"And I John am he that heard and saw these things. And when I heard and saw, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel that showed me these things. And he saith unto me, See thou do it not; I am a fellow-servant with thee and with thy brethren the prophets, and with them that keep the words of this book: worship God." Rev. 22, 8-9.

5. Vain Repetitions.

Where prayers are looked upon largely as works of merit, as we have seen, and where there are so many forms of prayer that are recommended or even commanded to be used, there the danger is great to practice vain reptitions of prayer. The most striking case in the Church of Rome is that of praying the Rosary.

48. What is the Rosary?

The Rosary is a very useful and easy form of prayer, mental as well as vocal, introduced by St. Dominic in the thirteenth century; it has been approved by the Church, and is universally practiced by good Christians.

49. Of what does the Rosary consist?

The Rosary consists of the Apostles' Creed, the Glory be to the Father, the Our Father, and the Hail Mary, succeeding each other in a certain order, accompanied by meditations on the principle mysteries of our redemption.

The following is the Rosary of the Blessed Virgin:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.
I believe in God the Father, etc.
Our Father, etc.
Hail Mary, three times.
Glory be to the Father, etc.

Such a series of prayer is repeated again and again, as any one may see in some Catholic church as he observes a person on his knees and engaged in prayer, counting the beads of the Rosary. (However, we do not think it proper to go into a Catholic church simply to see these things.)

Such formal and mechanical methods of prayer remind one directly of our Savior's words:

"And in praying use not vain repetitions, as the Gentiles do; for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking. Be not therefore like unto them; for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him.' Matt. 6, 7-8.

PURGATORY.

The subject of Purgatory is not treated in the catechism under its own head, but appears only in connection with other subjects. Under "The Communion of Saints" we find this:

39. Who are members of this Communion of Saints?

1. All the members of the Catholic Church on earth — that is, the Church militant;

2. All the souls in Purgatory — that is, the Church suffering;

3. All the Saints in heaven — that is, the Church triumphant.

42. How do the souls in Purgatory share in our spiritual goods?

They are assisted by our prayers, alms — deeds, the application of Indulgences, by other good works, but especially by the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

"It is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead that they may be loosed from their sins." — 2 Machab. xii. 46.

Under "Satisfaction" the following occurs:

62. What is the temporal punishment due to our sins?

The temporal punishment due to our sins is that which we have to suffer either here on earth, or in Purgatory.

Under "Indulgences" the following is given:

73. Can Indulgences be applied also to souls in Purgatory?

Yes, all those which the Pope has declared to be applicable unto them.

In the larger work of Perry we find these statements:

What do you mean by Purgatory? — A middle state of souls suffering for a time on account of their sins.

What souls go to Purgatory? — Souls such as depart this life in lesser sins, which we call *venial*.

Do any other souls go to Purgatory? — Yes; such souls as leave this world before they have fully discharged the debt of *temporal* punishment due for their *mortal* sins, the guilt and *eternal* punishment of which have been remitted.

How do you prove there is a purgatory? — Because the Scripture often teaches that God will render to every man according to his works, and that nothing defiled can enter heaven; and that some Christians shall be saved, yet so as by fire.

The only question we need to consider in connection with Purgatory is whether there is a Purgatory or not. If there is no such place at all then the matter of helping souls out of Purgatory by our prayers, indulgences, Mass and other efforts needs no attention whatever.

We shall first look at the proof passage given under question 43 above. This passage, however, is taken from one of the Apocryphal books which were never accepted by the Church at large as inspired and as of equal authority with the inspired Scriptures.

We give here but one reason why the Apocryphal books are not to be received as inspired, a reason which any ordinary reader of the Bible can look into for himself. In the New Testament we find hundreds of quotations from the Old Testament, but not a single one from the Apocryphal books. This is conclusive proof that neither Christ nor the apostles considered those writings inspired; and they therefore did not use them to prove

any of their teachings. This should be proof sufficient that the Church at no time may use those writings to prove her doctrines. Those writings may be read; and there are many useful lessons which we may learn from them; but we dare not use them to establish any doctrine that is not clearly taught in the Scriptures.

Perry in his "Instructions" appeals to quite a number of Scripture passages, but they are not at all applicable. We shall consider only one, since this particular passage might make some people a little trouble. It is found in I Cor. 3, 15: "If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire."

Here notice, in the first place, that the thing that is burned are the man's works, not the man himself. The man himself is saved; by a very close margin, it is true; just as one might snatch away an object about to be enveloped by flames, so the man is saved. His work, however, perishes. Yet according to Rome it is just the work that is to get a man out of Purgatory. But if that work perishes, which smiply means that God rejects it, how then is it going to save the man? One sees at once how inconsistent the Romish argument is. If it were even true then that Paul is here speaking of a Purgatory, his statement would show conclusively that a man is not saved out of Purgatory by any of his works, neither by good works nor by works of suffering.

But Paul is not speaking of a Purgatory at all. The context shows that he is speaking of teaching and of rearing up churches or congregations by teaching. The foundation which has been laid is Jesus Christ. Upon this foundation the Church is to be built; and the building is to be done by teaching the truth. This truth the

apostle represents as "gold, silver, costly stones," while error is represented as "wood, hay, stubble". Then he declares that the day is coming when this work which the teacher has done will be tried, namely, at the judgment day. It shall be tried too by fire: for, as is taught in many places in Scripture, at the Judgment Day everything will be consumed by fire except the everlasting truth. If the building then which the teacher has reared up by his teaching is throughout a work of truth, it shall stand. If, however, it is a work built up with error, then it shall be consumed, yet the man himself, if he believed on Christ as his only hope of salvation, shall be saved.

Note especially this, too, that the apostle does not speak of a *place* of burning but of a *day* that shall burn. That he has in mind the Judgment Day should be clear to any unprejudiced reader.

We now give some of the clear passages of Scriptures showing that there can be no such place as Purgatory. First, some proof that there are only two places beyond:

"Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly cleanse his treshing-floor; and he will gather his wheat into his garner, but the chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire." Matt. 3, 12.

"And these shall go away into eternal punishment: but the righteous into eternal life." Matt. 25, 46.

Also some proof that the dead go to these places at once at their death:

"And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and that he was carried away by the angels into Abraham's bosom; and the rich man also died, and was buried.

And in hades he lifted up his eyes, being in torments." Luke 16, 22-23.

"And he said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." Luke 23, 43.

"Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from Samaritan," namely, any one who is in need, whether their labors; for their works follow with them." Rev. 14, 13.

By those "who die in the Lord" cannot be meant only a very few who are peculiarly holy and who go direct to heaven without passing through Purgatory, but the phrase includes all who are at all saved. They all pass to their rest at once. Especially could it not be said of the penitent thief that he passed direct to heaven, for he, above most people, would have needed to spend a long time in Purgatory to atone for his crimes.

In conclusion: In speaking of the second coming of Christ Paul says that "the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we that are alive, that are left, shall together with them be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord." I Thess. 4, 16-17. Here we are told expressly that all believers who will yet be living at the Lord's second coming shall be caught up with the righteous dead, which have been raised, into the air and ever be with the Lord. It would be very strange that all those should be fit to go at once to heaven while among all those who die there is only one now and then, according to Rome's teaching, who is not required to pass through Purgatory for his final cleansing.

THE SPIRIT OF ROME.

Relative to our neighbor there is the second great commandment, as our Savior puts it. (Matt. 22, 39): "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Who our neighbor is is clearly shown in the story of the "Good Samaritan," namely, any one who is in need, whether he be a friend or an enemy. To love him means to help him in his need and under no circumstances to do him any harm. There is only one way of proving our love to our neighbor, namely, by serving him — doing him good in some form or other.

Jesus loved all men, His friends and His foes. He did no one any harm. No matter how much His enemies hated Him and cursed Him, He still loved them and prayed for them. The apostles did the same. No matter how much they were opposed in their teaching and work, they harmed no one in turn. Like Jesus they cheerfully suffered at the hands of their enemies and prayed for them.

The Jews put Jesus to death because of His teachings; they persecuted the apostles and put them to death because of their teachings; they persecuted the first believers and put many of them to death because of their faith in Christ. Later their Pagan rulers persecuted the Christians and put thousands of them to death because of their faith. But during all the years of the first century or two the Christians or the Church never lifted a hand to harm any of their enemies. Nor did they persecute such as did not agree with them in doctrine.

They tried to convince them of their errors, but they did them no bodily harm.

Later on, however, these things began to change. Especially after the Papacy became firmly established in Rome and the pope began to assume civil powers and to wield the sword; then the church, that is, the Romish church, began to persecute those who differed from her in doctrine and who refused to accept all her teachings and ordinances. Thinking that the Church was authorized by the Lord himself to search out and punish in a bodily way all false teachers and wielding the powers of the state to a great extent, the popes, that is, the Romish church, proceeded to do this very thing.

Thus July 6, 1415, John Huss was burned at the stake because he preached the Gospel contrary to the teachings of Rome.

To show the spirit of these persecutions we here quote from the "Schaff-Herzogg Encyclopedia," showing in a few words what was done upon this occasion. After being condemned as a heretic, "Huss fell on his knees, and, lifting up his hands, appealed to Heaven, and prayed for his enemies. Thereupon followed his degradation, from the priestly office, and all cried out together, 'Thy soul we deliver up to the devil.' Huss answered, 'And I commend it to the holy Lord Jesus.' Then a paper cap a yard high was placed on his head, with the writing, 'Heresiarcha!' He was then led forth to the judgment-square, his neck bound by a chain to a stake. As the flames rose around him, he refused again to recant, and died singing, 'Christ Thou Son of the Living God, Have Mercy Upon Me.' His ashes were thrown into the Rhine."

The next year after Huss' martyrdom, on May 30, Jerome of Prague was burned at the stake for teaching the Gospel contrary to the wish of Rome.

For similar reasons Savonarola was burned at the stake on April 7, 1498.

John Wiclif, often called the "Morning Star of the Reformation," was born in 1324. His chief work was the translation of the Bible into English. For this and his teaching contrary to the decrees of Rome, he was persecuted, yet permitted to die a natural death. However, forty-four years after his death his bones were taken up and burned as those of a heretic and the ashes cast in the river Swift that runs by the place.

The Romish church created a sort of religious court called "The Inquisition" whose duty it was to search out all heretics and false teachers and either make them recant or else have them put to death. Under the powers of this court thousands upon thousands of believers were seized, put on the rack, imprisoned, tortured in unspeakable ways, left to perish, or violently put to death.

On August 24, 1572, there was a massacre of Huguenots in France on account of their faith. In all about thirty thousand people were murdered upon that one occasion. It is generally known as "The Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day," because it was planned to take place on that saint's day. "As soon as the news was received in Rome, the cannons of St. Angelo were fired, a solemn *Te Deum* was sung, and the pope struck a medal bearing on the one side his own portrait, and on the other a picture rudely representing the massacre."

These are but some of the persecutions and horrors of which the Romish church has been guilty; and there is reason to believe that if she had the power she would

do similar things today yet. She still seems to believe that heretics, in fact all who depart from her teachings, if they do not recant, should be punished in some bodily manner; and if she had the power and authority, so that she could compel the civil officers to do her will, she would yet carry out here purposes, and freedom of conscience and liberty of worship would again be things of the past.

How is it possible to look upon a church that has done such things and that has never acknowledged her sins and crimes and that today yet shows the same spirit toward all such as differ from her, as the true Church upon earth, as she claims to be, without whom no one can hope to be saved who is not within her fold and under the pope?

This one mark alone, without here speaking of her many false teachings and sinful ordinances, stamps the Romish church as a false church and her priesthood, whose head is the pope, is as largely the instrument of the "father of lies," who was a murderer from the beginning.

These things are said of the priesthood of the Romish church and not of the people. The people are largely helpless as was seen in past chapters and are sincerely to be pitied.

A LIST OF ROMISH ERRORS AND HERESIES.

In conclusion and for the purpose of giving a general view of the things that have been discussed we here offer a list of the chief errors and heresies of the Romish church. For some we also give the approximate dates when they were fixed as doctrines or ordinances in the church:

That the Church is an external organization.

That the pope is the visible head of the Church. About the 7th century.

To be saved one must belong to this organization and be under the pope.

That the pope is infallible. 1870.

That the priesthood has special spiritual powers which the common people do not possess.

That people must come to the priest to get forgiveness of sins.

That the person confessing must recount his sins.

That priests dare not marry. 1070.

That the Church has the right to put heretics to death.

That the civil rulers should be subject to the Church.

That the Bible is not a sufficient rule of faith and life.

That the Bible is not a safe book for the people to read.

That the Bible was often taken from the people.

That Tradition and the Decrees of the councils are of equal authority with the Holy Scriptures.

That faith is nothing more than merely to take God's word to be true.

That a man is not saved by grace through faith alone without works.

That a man must make satisfaction for the temporal punishment of sin.

That the saints have merits that avail for us. About the 8th century.

That an indulgence procures a certain forgiveness of sin. 13th century.

That justification consists in being made holy.

That in the Lord's Supper the bread and the wine are changed into the body and the blood of Jesus. About the 13th century.

That in the Mass Christ is again offered by the priest in an unbloody manner. About the 6th century.

That the Host after consecration is to be worshiped. 13th century.

That the wine in the sacrament is not given to the laity. About 14th century.

That confirmation is a sacrament. 13th century.

That marriage is a sacrament.

That ordination is a sacrament. 12th century.

That Extreme Unction is a sacrament and imparts grace. 5th century.

That prayer merits something.

That we should pray for the dead. 7th century.

That saints can hear prayer and may be worshiped. About 8th century.

That adoration should be given to images. 8th century.

That relics possess healing powers.

That there is such a place as Purgatory. 7th century.

DATE DUE

THE KING'S LIBRARY
3000096285

W9-CWR-137